A

Dialogue

BETWEEN A

Popish Priest

AND AN

English Protestant.

Wherein the Principal Points and Arguments of both RELIGIONS are truly Propoſed, and fully Examined.

By *MATTHEW POOL*,
Author of the
SYNOPSIS CRITICORUM.

LONDON:
Printed for *Tho. Cockeril*, at the *Three Legs* in the *Poultrey*, over-againſt the *Stocks-Market*. MDCLXXXVII.

TO THE READER.

THE variety and differences of Religion between *Proteſtant* and *Papiſts*, diſtract the minds, and trouble the hearts of all that have any Senſe of Religious Concernments. In this diſtraction, every ſerious man that hath any care of his Soul, cannot chuſe but heartily deſire to ſeek for Reſolution. To obtain this, there can be no better way, than to underſtand and examine the Pretenſions and grounds of both Religions. In order to this, I have endeavoured faithfully to preſent, and duly to weigh them in the following Diſcourſe.

Wherein, tho I have not diſcuſſed all the points in Controverſy between us

and them; yet I have ſelected the moſt material, and have diſcourſed of moſt, if not all their weighty and plauſible Arguments againſt the *Proteſtant Religion.* And this I may ſay, and no knowing *Papiſt* I think will deny it, all the other points will follow the fate of thoſe which are here examined, and live or dye with them. I know it will be pretended, That I have managed the Work with partiality and deceit; and that I make the *Papiſt* ſpeak what I pleaſe, not what they think. This muſt be ſaid of courſe, elſe the *Romaniſts* loſe their old wont. Nor ſhall I at all think it ſtrange if inſtead of ſolid Anſwers, they return Calumnies; their cauſe requires it; and no wonder if they that want Truth in their Religion, make Lies their Refuge.

To ſilence all Clamours, and ſatisfie all Jealouſies, will be impoſſible: I ſhall never attempt it.

But for Satisfaction of ſuch as are Rational and Ingenious, I ſhall give this following account.

1. God is my Witneſs, that I did diligently endeavour to pick out the ſtrong

eſt Arguments I could find in their beſt Authors in each Point; nor have I willingly declined any thing of moment in the queſtions here debated; if any *Papiſt* think otherwiſe, let him produce their greater ſtrength, and I hope he ſhall find it fairly examined.

2. The ſeveral Diſcourſes, Arguments and Anſwers which I put into the *Papiſts* Mouth, are ſuch as were firſt taken out of their Mouths; and ſo it is but a piece of Juſtice and Reſtitution, to return them thither. They are generally ſuch as are either known to be their Opinions, and by themſelves owned: or elſe delivered in the Senſe, and very oft in the words of their moſt approved Authors, whom I have quoted in the Margent. But here I expect the old Clamour of falſe Quotations, wherein they have been ſo often taken Tardy, that they muſt now look for the common Infelicity of——not to be believed if they ſhould chance to ſtumble upon Truth. All the relief I deſire in that caſe is, that the *Reader* who is able to do it, would examine them with his own eyes, and that will be my beſt Juſtifica-

tion. I shall detain thee no longer, but commend thee to the good Spirit of Truth, to enable thee to discern between Good and Evil.

T O

To the People of the *Romiſh* CHURCH.

THE *Controverſies between your Church, and ours, are by Gods bleſſing upon the endeavours of his Miniſters, brought to this paſs, That* I *am perſwaded there is nothing wanting to the Conviction of divers of you, but a free and diligent peruſal of their Books without prejudice and partiality. This your Prieſts knowing, it is their great deſign to keep you from looking into them; and to that end to poſſeſs you with this Principle,* That you need not trouble your ſelves to enquire into Books, you are ſafe enough ſo long as you believe as the Church believes, and follow the guidance of your Prieſts and Fathers. *If this be an Error, it is a dangerous one, and may prove damnable: That it is ſo, and that it will prove but a broken Reed when you lean upon it; I hope you will ſee there is Reaſon to believe, if you will but do your Souls that juſtice, not prodigally to caſt them away upon blind and wilful miſtakes, and take the pains to read theſe enſuing Lines.*

1. *If your Church be not Infallible, then this Principle is Rotten; howſoever your can't with ſafety or diſcretion venture your Souls on it, till you have examined at leaſt this one point of the Churches Infallibility; do but examine that, and*

if you do not ſtifle both Reaſon and Conſcience, you will ſee it is a meer cheat.

2. *If the Church* (that is, *a Pope with a Council*) *were Infallible* (*which is all that your great Champions plead for*) *yet all Confeſs, that your particular Prieſts* (*upon whoſe Conduct you hazard your Eternal welfare*) *are Fallible, and ſubject to miſtakes. It's moſt certain, that divers of your Prieſts and Confeſſors lead you into many* (*and ſome of them*) *damnable Errors. Thouſands of your Prieſts, and Learned Doctors, do charge the Jeſuits with poyſoning the Souls of the People with divers peſtilent and damnable Errors, ſuch as theſe:* That a Man may venture his Soul upon any probable Opinion; and that is probable, which but one of their Learned Doctors affirm. That a private Man may kill his Enemy to maintain his Honour, tho not by way of Revenge. That a Prieſt may Abſolve even old and inveterate Sinners, and ſuch as he believes incorrigible. That Affliction, or Sorrow for Sin, ariſing meerly from fear of Puniſhments, is ſufficient for Salvation; and, that the Affection of Loving God, is not abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation. *All theſe and many more are clearly proved out of their own Words and Writings in the Provincial Letters, otherwiſe called,* The Myſtery of Jeſuitiſm: *See the Latin Edition ſet forth and defended by* Wendrokius *Now if the Jeſuits may, and do, ſo damnably deceive thoſe thouſands of you that depend upon their Counſel and Conduct, why may not other Orders deceive you in other things? Or what is there that can give you any reaſonable Security? Is it their Learning, Prudence,*

pretended

pretended Devotion, or Honesty, or any other such like quality? Why, divers of the Jesuits have given as plausible Testimony of these things (so far as Men can judg) as most of the other Orders; or will you say, all other Orders are Infallible, the Jesuits only excepted?

3. *Nothing can be more evident (if the Bible be the word of God) than that the error or misguidance of the Priest, will not excuse the Sin of the People. To satisfie you in this, I beseech you consider these few Reasons.*

1. *The Scripture condemns, and God severely punished those People which did follow the Errors of their Priests. This did not excuse the* Jews *in* Aarons *time, that they were misled by* Aaron, Exod. 32. *nor those in the times of the wicked Kings of* Israel *and* Judah, *that their Priests did universally deceive them; and poor* Elijah, *and so* Michaiah, *were left alone; nor those in* Malachi's *days, that* the Priest caused them to stumble at the Law, *Mal.* 2. 8. *nor the Crucifiers of Christ, that they obeyed the Decrees of their Priests and Rulers.*

I list not to repeat what I have said elsewhere; therefore read Nullity of Romish Faith, Chap. 2. Sect. 12. *And will you yet stumble at the same Stone?*

2. *The People will not be excused by their Priests misguidance, because they neglect their Duty. If indeed there were no Duty incumbent upon the People but to believe what your Priests say, and do what they require, then your Church speaks Reason. But that none but a mad man will say.*

Ther-

There are ſeveral Duties required of the People, no leſs than of the Prieſts; the Law of God was not given only to the Prieſts, but to all the People; God publiſhed this Law in the hearing of all the People, and ſpeaks in the ſingular number to every one of the People; Thou ſhalt do or forbear *this or that; and the curſe is threatned to the People, Deut.* 27. 26. Curſed be he that confirmeth not all the Words of this Law to do them; and all the People ſhall ſay, *Amen. Which the Apoſtle repeats, Gal.* 3. 10. Curſed is every one, *not the Prieſts only, but the People too*, that continueth not in all things which are written in this Book of the Law to do them. *If the Prieſts* then *ſhould have taught the* Iſraelites, *(as your Prieſts* now *teach you)*, Thou ſhalt worſhip a Graven Image, *when God ſaith,* Thou ſhalt not worſhip a Graven Image; *Can any ſerious Man think this would have freed them from that curſe; and that it was ſafer for them to obey the command of Men, than of God? O the impudence of your Prieſts that dare ſay ſo? Oh the blockiſhneſs of thoſe People that will believe them, when they ſay ſo;* your Pope *may well contend with* us, *for it ſeems your* Prieſts *will conteſt with* God *for* Supremacy *When the Prieſts and Prophets in* Iſaiahs *days were generally corrupted, the People are not adviſed to believe all that they taught, and to obey all that they decreed, (which is the ſtrain of your Church), but are commanded immediately to go to the* Law, and to the Teſtimony; *and* if any ſpeak not according to them, *they are to be rejected,* becauſe there is no light in them, *Iſa.* 8. 20. *Even People are required*

not

not to believe every Spirit, *but* to try the Spirits, 1 *Joh.* 4. 1. *Nor did the Apoſtles exempt themſelves and their Doctrines from this* Tryal, *but allowed, commended, and required it in the People.*

The Beræans *are not reproved and cenſured (as they would certainly be that ſhould tread in their ſteps, at* Rome) *but commended for examining the Doctrine of St.* Paul *by the Scripture,* Acts 17. 11. *And the ſame Apoſtle allows the* Galatians, *not only to try his Doctrines, whether they were agreeable to what they had received; but in caſe they find them contrary, he gives them Commiſſion to Cenſure and Anathematize him,* Gal. 1. 8, 9. *And he beſpeaks the* Corinthians *in this Language,* I ſpeak to wiſe men, judg you what I ſay, 1 *Cor.* 10. 15. *And he commands the* Theſſalonians *to* prove all things *(without Exception) as well as to* hold faſt that that is good, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 21. *Conſider theſe things, I beſeech you, and do not wilfully caſt away your precious Souls upon Triſtes. God hath given the Scripture as a Rule to try things by; and this was written for the Ignorant, and the People, as well as the Learned, and the Prieſts;* Joh. 20. 31.) *he hath given People Reaſon to try things with; if you will hide theſe Talents in a Napkin, at your peril be it. The Prince was commanded to* read and meditate in the Book of the Law, that he might obſerve to do all that is written therein, *Joſh.* 1. 8. *Can you ſeriouſly think, that if the corrupt Prieſts had agreed to teach him to do contrary to all that was written therein, that this would have excuſed him before God? Then that precept was both ſuperfluous and dangerous.*

gerous; and if you do not think so (as you must needs, if you have any Conscience), then neither will it excuse your People; for according to the Doctrine of your Church, Prince and People, are alike in this, both tied to believe as your Church believes. God commands every Christian to prove his own Work; *and tells us, that* every man shall bear his own burthen, *Gal.* 6. 4, 5. *and that* every man shall give an account of himself to God, *Rom.* 14. 12. *(Do not think your Priests account shall serve turn) and all the Christian People of* Corinth *are commanded to* examine themselves whether they be in the Faith, 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *and dare you still live in the wilful breach of all these commands, and blindly give up your Souls and Consciences by an implicit Faith, to the conduct of your Priests, to lead them whither they please?*

3. *The Scripture hath given you full warning of your danger. Read but two places,* Ezek. 33. 8. *(where God assures us, that the* wicked shall dye in his iniquity, *tho he perished through the Watchmans fault) and* Mat. 15. 14. *(where Christ confutes this very Opinion of yours, which was also the Opinion of the* Jews, *that they were safe enough while they followed their Priests Decrees and Counsels; and tells them,* If the Blind lead the Blind, both shall fall into the Ditch), *and doubt of this if you can or dare.*

In a Word; if this senseless Doctrine were true, not only Men would have Dominion over our Faith, contrary to express Scripture; Be not ye called Masters, for one is your Master, even Christ, *Matth.* 23. 10. Not that we have Dominion over your Faith, *(said the great Apostle*

but also Christ should lose his Dominion, and have no Authority in his Church, but as your Priests please; and it seems he shall not have this favour from you, to continue in his Office, quamdiu bene te gesserit, *but* quamdiu vobis placuerit; *and Christs Power is apparently limited to your Interpretation; but the Power of the Church is absolute and unlimitted, and the People obliged to believe them,* quamcunque sententiam tulerint, *whatsoever they shall Decree, as* Gretser *expresseth it. If this be not to make the Word and Authority of God and Christ void, through our Tradition, I know not what is. I will trouble you no further: If you be capable of Counsel, take warning, and suffer not your selves to be led Hoodwinkt to Hell, to serve a carnal Interest of some among you; but quit your selves like Men, and by the Grosness of this Delusion, learn to suspect the rest; and with humble and honest Hearts, Read what is here proposed to you for your Souls good, and God give you light. Let my Soul prosper no otherwise than I heartily wish the Good and Salvation of you all; but if you will still persist in your Blindness, and add further Obstinacy to your Errors, I shall comfort my self in this, That I have delivered my own Soul; your Blood be upon your own Head; for there it will assuredly fall, and not upon the Priests only.*

A DIALOGUE between a *Popiſh Prieſt*, and an *Engliſh Proteſtant*.

Pop. *DEAR FRIEND, I am glad to meet with you after ſo long a ſeparation; for I remember we were brought up at the ſame School, and I rejoyce in the opportunity of renewing our Acquaintance. I deſire a little Diſcourſe with you, to underſtand how it is with you in point of Religion.*

Prot. I am of the Proteſtant Reformed Religion.

Pop. *I am heartily ſorry for it in regard of our old Intimacy; but if you will give me leave, I do not queſtion, but in a very little time to give you ſuch Reaſons as will force you to leave thoſe damnable Errors, and return to your Ancient Mother the Church of* Rome.

Prot. With a very good will ſhall I yield my ſelf to your Inſtructions; I deſire nothing more than true Information; I know I have a Soul to ſave, which is of infinite worth, and I am not fond of Damnation; therefore if you give me better

better Grounds than I have, you ſhall not find me obſtinate; but this I muſt tell you, You muſt not put me off with Fancies and bare Affirmations; but I ſhall expect ſolid Proof of what you ſay from Scripture or Reaſon; and now ſpeak what you pleaſe.

Pop. *Firſt, my dear Friend, I muſt intreat you to conſider that which your own Miniſters teach you, to wit, That there is no Salvation to be had out of the true Catholick Church, which is the Church of* Rome.

Prot. That none is ſaved out of the true Catholick Church, I grant (for the Catholick Church includes all Believers in the World): but a man may be ſaved that is no member of the *Roman*, nor of any perticular Church; for altho you ingroſs to your ſelves the name of the Catholick Church, nothing is more clear, than that the Church of *Rome* is at beſt but a part of the Catholick Church, and that a very unſound one too, and there is a falſe Church (in which Salvation cannot ordinarily be had) as well as a true Church (out of which it cannot ordinarily be had); and I have heard more to prove yours to be this falſe Church, than I am able to anſwer, or you either, as I ſuppoſe; therefore this being only a general (and ſo an unconcluding) Argument, I deſire you to come cloſer to the Point.

Pop. *Then I intreat you conſider the danger of your way, and the ſafety of ours; ſince all your Miniſters confeſs, That a* Roman *Catholick may be ſaved in his Religion; but all our Church unanimouſly declare, that you are damned if you live and die in your Religion.*

Prot.

Prot. You call us Schiſmaticks; but by this Argument you prove your ſelves to be ſo: For I have oft heard it, that in the very ſame manner thoſe infamous Schiſmaticks, the *Donatiſts*, argued againſt St. *Auſtin*, and the Catholick Church, That he confeſſed Salvation was to be had in their Churches, which they affirmed was not to be had in the Catholick Church; and this very thing was by St. *Auſtin*, and the Church of that Age condemned as their great Schiſmatical Principle. But let that paſs. To come to your Argument, Remember the Condition I made with you, that you do not put me off with Fancies, and bare Affirmations, for I expect you ſhall make good every Word you ſay. Now here I find you under a great miſtake; and tho I have heard it moſt confidently delivered by divers of your Brethren, yet you muſt give me leave to believe my own Eyes and Ears: I read it in divers Books of our Learned Engliſh Divines, and I have heard it from divers very able Scholars and Miniſters, That Popery, in theſe times and places of light, is to thoſe that may ſee that light, and will not, not only dangerous, but damnable; nor do I pin my Faith upon their Sleeves, but they have given me not meer Affirmations, as you do; but ſuch Arguments as I confeſs I cannot anſwer; yet if you can, I ſhall be ready to hearken to you.

Pop. *It is eaſie to ſay in general, That our Religion is dangerous or damnable; but I beſeech you ſhew me wherein; which are thoſe Doctrines and Practices of ours wherein the danger lies?*

Prot.

Prot. I will instance in few of many particulars.

First, That Idolatry is a damnable Sin, your own Authors grant; and Scripture expresly affirms, *Idolaters shall not inherit the Kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10. and Rev. 21. 8. and 22. 15. And that your Church is guilty of Idolatry, especially in the worship of Images, and of the Host or Consecrated Bread in the Sacrament, is the Doctrine of all Protestant Churches, and I shall prove it before you and I have done.

Secondly, That the Worshippers of the *Babyloniſh* Beast, *Rev.* 13. 14. are in a damnable Condition, you all grant; and it is affirmed by God himself, *Rev.* 14. 8, 9, 10, 11. And that *Rome* is that *Babylon*, the most and learned'st of your Doctors agree, only some of them pretend it is *Rome-Heathen*, as it was; and others, that it is *Rome-Jewiſh*, as it shall be at the end of the World; both which conceits are fully refuted by divers of our Authors.

Thirdly, That it is highly dangerous to trust in Man, and to trust in our own Righteousness sufficiently appears from Jer. 17. 5. *Curſed is he that truſteth in man*; and from that dreadful example of the *Jews*, who going *about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, did not submit* (and therefore loſt the benefit of) *the righteouſneſs of Faith*, Rom. 10. 3. and that you are guilty of this Sin, in truſting to Saints and your own Merits, shall appear in the following Diſcourſe.

Fourthly, It is dangerous to add to the word of God; and this your Church is not only deeply guilty of, in adding their Tradi-

(* *to be received with equal reverence to the holy Scriptures*) but obliges all its Members to justifie those Additions, and thereby intitle them to the same Plagues with themselves.

Fifthly, (To name no more). It is highly dangerous to *break any of Gods commands, and to teach men so, and to make the word of God of none effect by humane Tradition*; we know the woes Christ pronounceth against the *Pharisees* for these things. And this your Church is deeply guilty of, as in many other particulars, so most eminently in this, that you professs no Men are obliged to receive the Scriptures as the Word of God, nor to believe any Anything in it, but for the Testimony of your Church ||.

By this it appears, that you have no Reason to boast of the safeness of your way. And as for your threats of Damnation to all that do not submit themselves to your Church and Pope, however they may terrifie silly People, yet take it from me, to prudent Men it is rather an Argumnet of the falseness of your Religion. For such will be apt to conclude, that your Faith is not right, because your uncharitableness is so notorious and monstrous in condemning all the World besides your selves, and that too upon such frivolous Pretences. This Argument therefore of yours hath little Weight.

Let me hear what further you have to say against our Religion.

---

* *Concil. Trident.* || See my *Nullity of Romish* Faith, Cap. 2. Sect. 4.

Pop. *Then consider seriously of this, that your Church confesses, that She is Fallible, and that you have no infallible Judg among you, where Controversies may be ended; but our Church is Infallible.*

Prot. I confess now you speak home; mak this good, That it is necessary the Churc should be Infallible, and that yours is so, an I shall ease you of the trouble of further Ar guments; but I must ask you two Questions 1. What is the meaning of this Proposition And 2. How will you prove it? For the first, ask you how you understand it? What is th Church which you tell me is Infallible? A you agreed among your selves in that Point To tell me of an infallible Judg, and not t give me infallible Assurance of who this Judg is to deceive me with vain words, and will more end Controversies, than to tell me the is an infallible Judg in Heaven: For where, pray you, shall I find your Infallible Judg Now I am in quest of him, I intreat yo Counsel and Direction. Tell me then, Is it th Body of your Church, and multitude of Catho licks, that is your infallible Judg? Do yo make your People the Judg of Controve sies.

Pop. *No: For we all agree the Government the Church is Monarchical.*

Prot. Are you then agreed, that the Pop alone is the infallible Judg? Speak the Truth and the whole Truth, and nothing but th Truth.

Pop. *I will deal truly with you, we are not agreed in that point; the* French *Catholicks*

nerally deny it, and divers of our Eminent Doctors and Writers, as (Bellarmine *confeſſes* *) *and among the reſt a Pope*, Adrian *by name, denies it; and even they that ſeem to be better minded towards the Pope, acknowledg that* it is no Hereſy to deny this; and that divers good Catholicks deny it, and that it is but a diſputable Point ‡.

Prot. Is it then a General Council that is Infallible? Are you agreed in that? Deal truly and clearly with me.

Pop. *Then I muſt confeſs we are not all agreed in that neither: For the Pope will deny this, and all the* Jeſuits, *and* Italian *Catholicks, and others who aſcribe this Infallibility to the Pope only.*

Prot. Who then is this infallible Judg?

Pop. *The Pope, and a General Council agreeing togegether.*

Prot. Is there then at this time any General Council at *Rome*, or elſewhere, which doth agree with the Pope?

Pop. *No; but tho there be no Council now in their Perſons, yet there is in their Writings, and the Pope agreeing with them, is Infallible.*

Prot. But I have been told, that all your Doctors agree in this, That no Writing can be a Judg of Controverſies: If you deny this, I ſhould think the Writing of God (which you all acknowledg the Scripture to be) might challenge this Priviledg, as well as the Wri-

* *De Pontific. l.* 4. *c.* 2.

‡ *Creſſy in Exomolog.* In the Appendix, ch. 4. num 7. *Holden de Reſolutione fide, l.* 2. *c.* 1.

tings

tings of any Council of men. You all plead for the abſolute neceſſity of a living infallible Judge

Pop. *Tho Catholicks are divided in the manner of Expreſſion, yet all are agreed in this general Propoſition, That our Church is Infallible.*

Prot. Call you this only a difference in manner of Expreſſion, for one to ſay the Pope is Infallible, another to ſay he is Fallible? For upon ſome of you to affirm the Infallibility of Councils, others utterly to deny it? I beſeech you remember, I am inquiring after Particulars (and therefore do not put me off with deceitful Generals) who, and where is the Man or Men to whom I muſt go to be infallibly reſolved in all Controverſies? For if the King ſhould to his People he hath appointed a Judg to end their Civil Controverſies, this would be to purpoſe, unleſs he ſhould tell who that Judge So that till I hear you are agreed in this particular, my Doubts and Perplexities muſt remain. And then for the next point, I you, how you prove this Infallibility which pretend to? I muſt tell you, ſince it is very Foundation of your Faith, I expect clear and undeniable Proofs. I pray you me two or three of your ſtrongeſt Arguments.

Pop. *In this you ſpeak Reaſon, and I ſhall comply with your deſires. I ſhall give you two three plain and evident Scriptures to prove*

1. *That of* Mat. 16. 18. *Hence I thus argue, Church is ſaid to be built upon St.* Peter, *the Rock ſpoken of; and this Rock doth together with St.* Peter, *include his Succeſſors; and Church built upon this Rock (that is, united*

and built upon the Pope) is infallible, for it is ſaid, The Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.

Prot. Not one of theſe things is true.

1. It is more probable that not *Peter*'s Perſon, but his Doctrine or his Confeſſion concerning Chriſt, (which now he made) is the Rock upon which the Church is built; Scripture is its own beſt Interpreter; It is not *Peter*, but Chriſt which is the Foundation of the Church, as he is called, *Iſa.* 28. 16. compared with 1 *Pet.* 2. 6, 7, 8. It is expreſly ſaid, 1 Cor. 3. 11. *Other foundation can no man lay but that that is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt*; and this is the more conſiderable, becauſe he ſpeaks againſt thoſe that made the Apoſtles Foundations, one ſaying, *I am of* Paul; *another, I of* Apollos, *I of* Cæphas. And if this were ſpoken of *Peter*, no more is ſaid of him here, than is ſaid of all the Prophets and Apoſtles, Epheſ. 2. 20. *Ye are built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets.* — And beſides, if by this Text *Peter* had been made Supreme and Infallible Head of the Church, and Judg of all Controverſies, no man in his Wits can believe that St. *Paul* would have treated him ſo irreverently (to ſpeak the leaſt) as he doth *Gal.* 2. (which is more conſiderable, becauſe then Chriſt was head, and *Peter* in the actual Exerciſe of his headſhip and Government; and if we may believe you, publickly and univerſally owned for ſuch) that he would have equalled himſelf with him as he doth, ver. 7. *The Goſpel of the Uncircumciſion was committed to me, as the Goſpel of the Circumciſion to* Peter: And that he would

would have spoken promiscuously of *James*, *Cæphas* and *John*, that they *all seemed to be Pillars*, verse 9. and not a word of *Peters* being the Rock and Foundation; and that he would have *withstood St.* Peter *to his face*, as he did Verse 11.

2. If this were meant of *Peter*, yet this is nothing to his Successors. You must first prove that St. *Peter* had a Successor in the supposed universal Headship, which will be very hard to perswade any understanding Man for, 1. That Authority which the Apostles had over all Churches, was peculiar to them, and died with them; we see God did not think it necessary to leave a Successor to *Moses*, (in his full and absolute Authority) no more was it necessary to leave any after *Peter* and the Apostles, and the Reason is the same, because the Work of the Law-giving was finish'd, and those that came after were tied to the Execution of their Law. 2. Besides, if *Peter* did leave a Successor, what prudent Man can believe that he would not have left some note thereof to the World in one of his Epistles? I find he saith, *I will endeavour that you may be able after my decease, to have these things in remembrance*, 2 Pet. 1. 15. How easy had it been to have added, *to that end I leave a Successor whom you must hear in all things?* I find Moses was very careful to leave a Successor, and that was *Elias* and *David*, and Christ (*as my Father sent men, so send I you*). Was *Peter* the only careless Person, that would not be at the expence of a Word to prevent all those Heats, Schisms and Contentions, which were

hen broached, and most likely to encrease after the death of the Apostles in the Christian world?

3. If any did succeed St. *Peter* in his Headship, one would think it should have been one of the surviving Apostles, especially St. *John* who lived above twenty years after him; for who can believe (that regards what he believes) that *Linus* or *Clemens* who is said to be St. *Peter*'s Successor, should be superiour to St. *John*? yet the foundation of all your Religion is built upon this nonsensical opinion. And if this priviledg did belong not only to *Peter*, but some of his Successors; yet to say it belongs to all following Popes (divers of which are acknowledged to be apostatical and most wicked wretches); and that such Monsters as were the true slaves of the Devil, and brands of Hell, should be the foundations of the Church, by whom the Church was to be secured from the gates of Hell, will not find belief with serious Men, till East and West meet togerher: and besides, when our Divines say, The Pope is Antichrist, and the Man of Sin; you use to answer, that these expressions, *the Antichrist*, and *the man of sin*, must needs point at a particular Man, and not a whole Order of Men; which if it be true, the expression there used of this *Rock* (especially being so particularly levell'd at *Peter*, as you will needs have it) cannot with any colour be thought to mean a Succession of many hundreds of persons. And sure I am, whatever the Text speaks of *Peter*, it speaks not one word of *Peter*'s Successors, and therefore it

is as eaſie for me to deny it, as you to affi
it.

4. Whatever this promiſe or priviledg is
belongs no more to the Church of *Rome*, t
to the Church of *England*, the name of on
here as clear as the other: It is a general p
miſe extending to the Church at all times
places; ſignifying, that God will have
maintain a Church to the end of the Wor
And if this place concerns only thoſe that
built upon St. *Peter*, you grant the Church
England once was, as the Church of *Rome*
is, built upon him too, when it was ſubject
the Pope: And if their being built upon
Peter did not ſecure them from Fallibility
Apoſtacy (as you ſay it did not), then c
ſequently the building of the Church of *R*
upon St. *Peter*, did not make them infalli
but they might (as we ſay and prove they
fall away. And certainly one of theſe two thi
muſt be granted, Either that every Chu
which did once adhere to *Peter*, or the P
are ſecured by this Text from falling aw
or elſe, that notwithſtanding this prom
every Church that now is ſubject to the P
may fall away from him, and ſo the Pope
be a Head without a Body, a Shepherd with
ſo much as one Sheep; For if this Text
prove what they deſire, that all that do
here to the Pope, whilſt they do ſo, are i
lible; yet it doth not prove, that they all
conſtantly adhere to him (which is quite
ther thing).

5. If this promiſe and priviledg did be
to any particular Church, and to yours (
ſpe

ſpecial manner), yet it doth not prove your Infallibility; this place concerns Doctrines no more than Manners, and ſecures your Church no more againſt damnable Hereſies, than againſt damnable Practiſes, ſince the gates of Hell prevail by one as well as by the other; and ſince you acknowledg that *Peter*'s Succeſſors have lived and died in damnable ſins, they might as well die in damnable Hereſies; Beſides, if this Text did prove the Popes Supremacy, yet here is not one word concerning his Infallibility, which is quite another thing.

6. If this Text did prove any Infallibility, it doth not prove the Popes Infallibility (which you alledg this Text for) but the Infallibility of the Church which is built upon it.

Pop. *But that Church is Infallible, becauſe they adhere to the Rock*, viz. *the Pope, who therefore muſt needs be more Infallible.*

Prot. Then it ſeems the foundation of all your Infallibility is in the Pope, as *Peter*'s Succeſſor, whom multitudes of your own Learned and approved Doctors acknowledg to be Fallible. I have heard you all confeſs, That your Popes may err in Manners and Practice. Is it ſo?

Pop. *Yes.*

Prot. Then whatſoever he thinks, he may ſpeak lies, and deceive the World, in telling them he is Infallible; and ſure if a Man will deceive for any thing, he will do it for ſuch an Empire as the Pope holds; but I have heard alſo your Popes may err in matters of fact.

Pop. *That we all agree in.*

Prot. Then he may miſtake and err in theſe

Questions, whether *Peter* left a Successor? and whether the Bishop of *Rome* be the person; and, whether there hath been that uninterrupted succession in the Papal Chair, which you pretend to be necessary, which must be Infallibly certain, or else the Pope holds his Authority only upon Courtesie; so this place will not stand you in much stead. Let me hear if you have any better Argument.

Pop. *There is another place, which if you will not an obstinate sort of men, would satisfie you all, and that is,* 1 Tim. 3. 15. *where the Church is called,* The pillar and ground of Truth, *and therefore is Infallible.*

Prot. Let me first ask you, What Church is there spoken of, which you say is Infallible? Is it the Church of *Rome?* Was *Timothy* Bishop of *Rome*, or no?

Pop. *No, he was Bishop of* Ephesus. *But why do you ask that question?*

Prot. This place apparently speaks of the Church in and over which *Timothy* was Bishop; so if it speak of any particular Church, it must be that of *Ephesus* (which you confess was Fallible) not that of *Rome*; or if it speak of the Universal Church, that might be infallible though the Pope and all the Church of *Rome* (truly so called) should fail and perish. Tell me, I beseech you, in particular, what is that Church, which from this and other places, you conclude to be Infallible?

Pop. *It is the Pope with the General Council, as I have told you.*

Prot. Then I pray you make sense of the verse; for to me it is meer nonsense; *Tim-*

is here advised to *behave himself rightly in the House of God, which is the Church of God, and the pillar and ground of Truth.* According to your opinion this is the sense of it, *That thou mightest know how to behave thy self in the Pope and a General Council.* I pray you tell me truly, was there a General Council then sitting?

Pop. *No, there was no General Council from that time, till two or three hundred years after, when the Council of* Nice *was assembled.*

Prot. Then it seems to me a most unreasonable thing to say, that *Paul* directs *Timothy* how to behave himself in a General Council (which was not then in being, nor like to be) and that he doth not direct him how to behave himself in that body, the Church, in which he then resided and ruled.

Besides, I pray you, Where is the Pope or a Council called the House of God? If they have any thing to do there, they are the Governor the Stewards, the Officers of the House, but are never called the House of God; but this Name is always ascribed to the multitude of believers and professors, as *Heb.* 2. 5, 6. where *Moses* (whose place in the Church the Pope pretends to) is not the House, but the *Servant, the Officer of it*; so *Heb.* 10. 21. *Having an High-Priest over the House of God* So 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. *Ye as lively stones are built up as a Spiritual House*; And if you know any one place where it is otherwise used, I pray speak; if not (as by your silence I see you do not) all understanding men will conclude, that neither Pope nor Council are concerned in this priviledg. But besides, let me further ask you

Can you give me assurance that these words which *is the ground and pillar of Truth*, imply Infallibility?

Pop. *It is true, the words are figurative and metaphorical; but that is the meaning of them.*

Prot. My old Friend, can you advise me to venture my Salvation upon a Metaphor? Sirs, that that is the true and only sense of the words? Prove it, and I am your prisoner; but it seemeth to me far otherwise. God saith to *Jeremy, I have made thee an Iron Pillar*, Jer. 1. 18. Was *Jeremy* therefore Infallible; peradventure that was too mean a metal to amount to Infallibility; but your Church is a brazen Pillar and so it seems by the impudence of your Assertions. I read in *Eusebius*, * That the Saints of *Vienna* and *Lyons*, called *Attalus* the Martyr *A pillar and ground of the Truth*; yet you will not allow him to be Infallible; by which and divers other passages it is sufficiently evident that a Pillar in the Church is no more than a man that is well rooted and grounded, and strong in the faith, as he is a reed that is not tossed to and fro with every wind of Doctrine; let me therefore hear if you have any better arguments.

Pop. *Then* Joh. 16. 3. *is an express promise.* When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; and *therefore our Church Infallible.*

Prot. Tell me, I pray you, is not this promise made to the Apostles only? If so, what

* *Lib.* 5. *Chap.* 1.

e word that to you? If you ſay otherwiſe, how do
, impl ou make it appear that it concerns their Suc-
eſſors?

tive a Pop. *That appears by comparing another*
f the *place with it*, Joh. 14. 16. The Comforter ſhall
e met bide with you for ever: *not ſurely in their per-*
ior? *ons, for they were to die in a little time, but*
of the *in their ſucceſſors.*

er; bu *Prot.* I expected a place which had ſaid at
faith the leaſt, that the Spirit ſhould lead them into
ſer. 1. ll truth for ever; but this is quite another
venturing; you dare not ſay, that every one with
o Infa hom the comforter abides, is infallible; but
n Pilla o forgive you this great miſtake, tell me truly,
our A s it then your opinion, that all the Succeſſors
e Sain f each of the Apoſtles, *viz.* all Biſhops, or
Martyrs ll Miniſters, are infallible?

you w Pop. *No, in no wiſe: for it is only St. Peter's*
ich a *ſucceſſors, or the Pope, who is infallible; and o-*
evide *hers only ſo far as they depend upon him, and*
than *leave to him.*

d, an *Prot.* Then this Text is not for your turn;
is to for if it do extend to the Apoſtles Succeſſors,
ctrine extends either to all, or none; for ſure I am,
bet this Text makes no difference; beſides, how
do you prove that theſe words of the Spirits
romi leading into all truth, if they do reach further
l gui than the Apoſtles, do imply infallibility? then
urch all believers are Infallible, for they are all led
by the Spirit, *Rom.* 8. 4.

is pr Pop *True, but here they are ſaid to be led*
wh *into all truth.*

Prot. You know the words *all* and *every* are
often taken in a limited ſenſe, as when the
Goſpel is to be preached to every creature

Mark 16. 15. And you may as well conclu the omniſciency of all believers, from 1 2. 20. *you know all things*; and *v.* 27. *the nointing teacheth you all things*: as the infall lity of your Popes or Councils from t phraſe: and one anſwer ſerves for both pla *viz.* that they ſpeak of all neceſſary truths. why do I hear nothing of *Luke* 22. 31. *Sim Simon, Satan hath deſired to winnow you, Bu have prayed that thy faith fail not*? I have he that *Bellarmine* uſeth this argument, but I co feſs, I thought they abuſed him.

Pop. *It is true, he doth uſe it, and it is a ſo one, though you ſcorn it.*

Prot. How do you know that it is meant all *Peter*'s Succeſſors? for there is not o word of them here. But if I grant theſe w meant, Do you then all believe that all *Pet* Succeſſors are Infallible?

Pop. *I did before acknowledg that we are vided in that point.*

Prot. Can you think to convince me wi that argument that does not ſatisfie your o Brethren? Moreover, tell me I pray you, Wh was the faith of *Peter* which was ſtruck at the Devil, and pray'd for by Chriſt?

Pop. *The event ſhews that; for the De tempted him, and prevailed with him to d his Maſter.*

Prot. Did *Peter* deny Chriſt doctrinally, a fall into the damnable error of disbelievi Chriſt to be the Meſſias? or was it only error of miſcarriage of his tongue, whi ſpoke againſt his Conſcience and judgment?

Pr

Pop. *Far be it from me, to ſay that* Peter *did ſo damnably err in his judgment, I know no Catholick who ſaith ſo; all do agree that it was only an error of his tongue and converſation, and a practical denial of Chriſt.*

Prot. Very well; Hence then I gather, that Chriſt prayed for his practical, not for his doctrinal faith; and that his grace of faith might not be utterly loſt by his fall; ſo that, if this Text and Prayer reach to your Popes, it ſhould rather ſecure them from damnable Apoſtacies in Practice (which you confeſs many of them fell into, and died in) than from hereſies (of which this Text ſpeaks not at all). But have you no other Arguments?

Pop *Yes, there is one more, which were ſufficient if there were no other, and that is from Gods Providence: It is unbecoming the Wiſdom of God to leave his Church without a guide, or Infallible Judg, by which means there would be no end of Controverſies; and ſince you do not pretend to have any ſuch in your Church, it muſt be in ours, or elſe there is none in the world.*

Prot. I had thought you would have only taught me, but now it ſeems you will teach God how to govern the world. It ſhould ſeem to me, that God was not of your mind; he did not think fit to end all controverſies, but to permit that there *ſhould be Hereſies*, 1 Cor. 11. 19. And if God in his wiſdom thought an Infallible Judg neceſſary, certainly that ſame Wiſdom would have named the place, perſon, or perſons, where people ſhould have found this infallibility. Was it ever known ſince the beginning of the World, that any Prince

conſtituted Judges in his Kingdom, not much as giving notice to his people who th were, to whom they muſt reſort for Juſtic this God hath not done; for you do not pr tend a particular place which ſettles this infal lible Judg at *Rome*, but only ſome general a fallacious Arguments, as I have proved; a beſides, it is ſo far from being evident, th your ſelves are not agreed about it; but ſo ſeek for this infallible Judgment in the Pop others in a General Council; and theſe do fiercely diſpute one againſt another in th point, as you do againſt us in many other and therefore it is much more rational for m to conclude thus; God hath not nominate and appointed ſuch an infallible Judg in t Church; therefore there is none, and it is n fit there ſhould be one; than ſawcily to unde take to be the Counſellor of the Almighty, a to tell him what is fit to be done, and th conclude that it is done. In ſhort, For Co troverſies about Fundamental and neceſſar things, God hath provided ſufficient means fo the ending of them, having clearly enoug determined them in his word for the ſatisfac on of all that are diligent, and humble, an teachable; And for Controverſies of leſſe moment, there is no neceſſity of having them ended; nor would they be much prejudicial to the peace of the World and the Church, i men would learn to give any allowance for th infirmities of humane nature, and exerciſe tha great and neceſſary duty of Charity and mutu al forbearance. But ſince this is all you can ſay, upon this particular, I pray you let m

hea

not hear what other Arguments you have againſt our Church and Doctrine

Pop. *Then another Argument againſt your Church and way, is taken from the Novelty of it; As for our Religion, it hath had poſſeſſion in the world ever ſince the Apoſtles days; but you are of Yeſterday, and know nothing; your Religion is an upſtart Religion, never heard of in the world till* Luther's *days.*

Prot. Firſt let me ask you this queſtion, If you had lived in the days of Chriſt, or of the Apoſtles, or of the Primitive Fathers, what would you have anſwered for your ſelf? you know better than I, that this was the very argument which *Jews* and *Heathens* urged againſt the *Chriſtians* then; they charged Chriſt with not *walking after the Tradition of the Elders*, Matth. 7. 5. And the *Athenians* ſaid to *Paul*, *May we know what this new doctrine is?* Acts 17. 19. and the *Phariſees* had Antiquity on their ſide, being *Zealous for the Tradition of the Fathers*, Gal. 1. 14. And tho it be true that the Apoſtles had the firſt Antiquity for them, delivering nothing but what for ſubſtance *was in Moſes and the Prophets*, Acts 26. 22. (which alſo is our caſe) yet the *immediate and latter Antiquity* was againſt them, and for divers ages together theſe Doctrines had been in great meaſure obſcured and unknown. What then would you have anſwered to a *Jew* or a *Heathen* objecting this Novelty to you? Learn from Chriſt, Who when the *Jews* pleaded for the continuance of their old practices in the matter of Divorces, he accounted it ſufficient confutation, that *from the beginning it was not ſo,*

ſo, Matt. 19. 7. And to all the pretences of th
Phariſees from antiquity, he oppoſeth this on
thing, *Search the Scriptures*, Joh. 5. 39. ſo yo
diſpute againſt us with the arguments whic
the *Phariſees* uſed againſt Chriſt, and we anſwe
you as He anſwered them; Beſides, let me as
you this queſtion, If I could clearly prove t
you all the points of our Faith, and diſpro
the points of yours, from the Holy Scripture
tell me, Would you then acknowledg the trut
of the Proteſtant Religion, notwithſtanding a
this pretended Novelty?

Pop. *Yes certainly, for we all confeſs the trut
of all that is contained in the Holy Scriptures.*

Prot. Hence then it follows undeniably, tha
the main thing that you and I muſt look to i
our faith is, that it be agreeable to the Hol
Scriptures; and if ours be ſo (as I am full
perſwaded it is) and yours the contrary, ne
ther antiquity is any argument for you, nor No
velty againſt us. Beſides, when you charge ou
Church with Novelty, I ſuppoſe you mean tha
our Doctrines are new.

Pop. *I do ſo.*

Prot. Then you cannot juſtly charge us wit
Novelty: For,

1. You confeſs the Antiquity and verity o
the moſt of our Fundamental Doctrines, and
your ſelves do approve them, only you mak
additions of your own to them; you own all
the Scriptures in our Bible, only you add th
Apocrypha; you acknowledg Scripture the rul
of Faith, only you add Tradition? we believe
all the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, (the

* belie

belief whereof the Ancient Fathers thought* sufficient to Salvation), and the Doctrine of the four first General Councils, as you do also; You own our Doctrine of Christs satisfaction, and Justification by Christ and Faith, only you add your own works and satisfaction; our two Sacraments you approve, only you add five more; our Doctrine of the two states of Men in Heaven and Hell you own, only you add Purgatory; You own Christ for your Mediator, and Prayers to God through him, only you add other Mediators; our worship of God you own, only you add Images. These are the principal points of our Religion, and dare you now say that our Doctrines are new?

2. Many of your ablest Doctors confess, that divers of the peculiar Doctrines of your Church are new and unknown to the Ancient Fathers; and it is most evident and undeniable concerning Indulgences, Purgatory, Communion in one kind, Worship in a strange tongue, the receiving some of your Apocryphal Books, Transubstantiation (especially as an Article of Faith) the Popes infallibility, Worship of Images, denying of the reading of the Scriptures to the people, and others. And will you yet brag of the Antiquity of your Religion?

3. These Doctrines wherein we differ from you, have been not only proved from Scripture, but from the plain testimony of Ancient Fathers, as I think none can doubt, that, laying aside prejudices, shall read what our *Jewel*

* See *Potter* and *Chillingworth*.

and

and *Morton*, and *Field*, and others have written; How then can you have the confidence to Charge us with Novelty?

Pop. *Your Church is new in this respect, that altho some others before you might own some your Doctrines, there was no Church that owned all your Doctrines both positive and negative.*

Prot. That is not necessary. I hope every alteration of Doctrines of less moment, does not make the Church new; if it doth, it is most certain, that your Church is new also for nothing can be more plain, than that the Catholic Church, nay, even your own Church at *Rome*, did not anciently, in former Ages, hold all these Doctrines which now she owns (as your own greatest Authors confess); this is sufficient, that the Church of God in most former Ages hath owned all our Substantial Doctrines. But what have you further to say?

Pop. *It is sufficient against you, that your Church is Schismatical, and you are all guilty of Schism, in departing from the true Catholick Church, which is but one, and that is the* Roman.

Pro. I desire to know of you, Whether in no case a man may separate from the Church whereof he was a member, without Schism?

Pop. *Yes certainly, if there be sufficient cause for it; for the Apostles did separate from the Church of the* Jews *after Christ's death, and the Orthodox separated from the* Arrian *Church, and all Communion with them, yet none ever charged them with Schism.*

Prot. Since you mention that instance, I pray you tell me, Why they separated from the *Arrians*?

Pop

Pop. *Because they held this Heresie, That Christ was a Creatnre, and not the true God.*

Prot. Very well; hence then I conclude, That if your Church do hold any Heresie, and require all her members to own it too, it is no Schism for us to separate from you.

Pop. *That must needs be granted; but this is but a slander of yours; for our Church holds no such Heresies.*

Prot. Your Church doth not hold one, but many dangerous Errors and Heresies, as I do not doubt to manifest ere you and I part; And if you please, we will leave the present Argument to this issue; If I do not prove your Church guilty of Heresie, and the imposition of it too, I am content you should charge us with Schism; If I do, you shall mention it no more.

Pop. *You speak reason, let it rest there.*

Prot. Besides, methinks, you deal barbarously with us, you drive us out from you by your tyranny, and then you blame us for departing; as if *Sarah* had call'd *Hagar* a Schismatick for going out of *Abraham*'s family, from which she forced her; Tell me, I pray you, if the case be so that I must depart from the *Roman* Church, or from God, What must I do?

Pop. *The case is plain, you must rather depart from that Church.*

Prot. This is the Case. If I do not depart from your Church, she will force me to live in many mortal sins. I must believe a hundred lies, I must worship the Cross, and Relicks, and Images, which God Commands me

under

under pain of his higheſt diſpleaſure, not t
worſhip. I muſt worſhip the Sacrament wi
Divine worſhip, which I am aſſured is no t
ther for ſubſtance than bread, for your Chur
is not content to hold theſe opinions, but i
enjoyns theſe practiſes to all her member
and if things be thus, I think you will n
have the confidence any more to charge
with Schiſm for obeying the command of G
to come out of *Babylon*, ſince you force all yo
members to partake with you in your ſi
Revel. 18. 4. Beſides all this, let me ask yo
upon what account you charge us wi
Schiſm?

Pop. *For departing from the Catholick Churc
and from your Mother Church of* Rome, a
from the Pope, whoſe Subjects once you were.

Prot. If then I can prove that we are n
departed from the Catholick Church, nor fro
our Mother Church, nor from any of that ſu
jection we owe to the Pope, I hope you wi
acquit us from Schiſm.

Pop. *That I cannot deny.*

Prot. Then this danger is over. For 1. W
never did depart from the Catholick Churc
which is (not *your particular* Roman *Church*
you moſt ridiculouſly call it, but *the whole mu
titude of Believers, and Chriſtians, in the world*
Nay, the truth is, you are the Schiſmaticks
renouncing all Communion with all the Chr
ſtian Churches in the World, except you
own (which are equal to yours in numbe
and many of them far ſuperiour in true Piety)
Next; we do not own you for our Mother
Jeruſalem which is above (not *Babylon* that
beneath

beneath) is the mother of us all. If we grant you now are a true Church, yet you were but a Siſter Church.

Pop. *You forgot that you received the Goſpel from our Hands.*

Prot. Suppoſe we did really ſo; Doth that give you authority over us? If it did, not *Rome*, but *Jeruſalem* ſhould be the Mother-Church, from whom you alſo received the Goſpel; This you deny; which ſhews that you do not believe your own Argument to be good. And for the Popes Univerſal and Infallible Authority which he pretends over all Chriſtians: I have diligently read your Arguments for it: and I freely profeſs to you, I find your pretences both from Scripture and Fathers, ſo weak and frivolous, that I durſt commend it to any underſtanding and diſintereſſed perſon, as a moſt likely means to convince him of the vanity and falſeneſs of that Doctrine; that he would peruſe any of your beſt Authors, and the very ſight of the weakneſs and impertinency of your Arguments would abundantly ſatisfy him of the badneſs of your Cauſe.

Pop. *You have no Miniſters, becauſe you have no uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles, as we have, and therefore you have no Church, and therefore no Salvation.*

Prot. I obſerve you take the ſame courſe that the Adverſaries of the Goſpel ever did, who when they could not reprove the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, they quarrelled with them for want of a Calling, as you may ſee, *Joh.* 1. 25. *Matt.* 21. 23. *Act.* 4. 7. But the good Chriſtians *of that time* took another courſe,

courſe, and examined not ſo much the Call the perſons, as the truth of the Doctrine, 8. 17. It ſeems to me a ſecret confeſſion your guilt, and the Error of your Doctrin that you are ſo careful to turn off mens ey from that to a far meaner point. But tell m Do you believe that ſuch an uninterrupte Succeſſion of Miniſters from the Apoſtle is abſolutely neceſſary to the being of Church?

Pop. *Yes verily, or elſe this Argument ſignifies nothing.*

Prot. How then can you convince me any other Chriſtian, that you have had ſuc an uninterrupted Succeſſion in your Church You muſt produce, and, it ſeems, I muſt re all thoſe many hundreds of great Volum wherein ſuch paſſages are mentioned. In tho you muſt ſhew me a perfect Catalogue of th ſeveral names of thoſe Popes, and others, wh have without interruption ſucceeded one ano ther ever ſince the Apoſtles days; and th Catalogue muſt be ſuch that all your Autho are agreed in (whereas I am told for ce tain, they differ very much in their repor therein, and are not ſo much as agreed a mong themſelves who was *Peter's* next Suc ceſſor, whether *Linus* or *Clemens*, or ſome ther perſon they know not who) and tho Hiſtorians that report theſe things, you mu aſſure me that they were infallible (whic you do not pretend they were) or elſe the might miſtake the things themſelves, and mi report them to me: and I have heard and read, that there have been divers Corruption

and Sch
p agai
he tru
he oth
hen w
thers
Miſtak
Was th
Pop
Chriſt
Prot
Pop
Prot
your g
ogeth
apoſto
Papal
violen
Pop
ſay ſo
Pro
puden
uninte
you m
that
ing M
Ordin
and fr
not?
Po
but if
from
preach
and

Call nd Schiſms even in your Church, one Pope ſet
ne, p againſt another, and each pretending to be
ſion he true Pope, and diſannulling all the acts of
ctrin e other; and that the Chriſtian people were
ns e hen wofully divided, ſome cleaving to one,
ell m thers to another; but it may be this was a
rupt iſtake of our Miniſters; therefore tell me,
oſtl Was this true or no?
of Pop. *I confeſs it was true, after the year of Chriſt* 1300, *there were ſeveral Popes at the ſame ſame, one at* Rome, *another at* Avignon.

Prot. And how long did this difference
ne ſt?
ſuc Pop. *For about* 50 *years.*
urch *Prot.* And is it true that I have heard, that
rea our great *Baronius* reports, that for 150 *years*
um *together the Popes were rather Apoſtates than*
tho *Apoſtolicks: and that they were thruſt into the*
f th *Papal Chair by the power of Harlots, and the*
wh *violences of the Princes of* Tuſcany?
ano Pop. *I muſt be true to you,* Baronius *doth*
thi *ſay ſo at the year* 897.
hon *Prot.* Then never henceforward be ſo im-
ce pudent to pretend to ſuch a lawful, clear and
om uninterrupted Succeſſion; but bluſh that ever
a you mentioned it. But beſides, I have heard
uc that divers of our firſt reformed and reform-
o ing Miniſters too, were ſuch as had received
o Ordination from, and in the Church of *Rome*,
u and from your Biſhops. Is it true? or is it
c not?
e Pop. *I will be ingenuous, Our Doctors confeſs it;*
i *but if your Miniſters or ſome of them had a call*
n *from our Church, yet they were only called to*
preach, not to overturn the world (as they did) and
undertake

undertake the Reformation of the whole Chu

Prot. You have said enough: if they w called to the Ministry, their Work and O was to bear witness to the Truth: and th fore to undeceive the World in those m Errors and Heresies which you had brought to the Church, and Ministers are set for defence of the Gospel: they were there bound by their Office to endeavour the Re mation of the Church, and Salvation of Sou and as in a great Fire (especially where p lick Officers neglect their Duty) every m brings his Bucket to quench it; so, in t miserable estate into which you had brou the Church (when the Pope and Bisho would not do their duty) it was the duty every Minister to endeavour, and to stir up t Kings and Magistrates of the World to end vour a Reformation. Surely you cannot p tend to an higher Privilege than St. *Paul*, a yet he gives all Ministers and Christians t leave and charge, that *if he himself should br any other Doctrine than what he had deliver* any Minister (though happily such a one received his calling from him) or Christi might not only forsake him, but *judg him curs'ed.* I shall only add this, our Ministers in a very hard case. I have discourse *Anabaptists*, who have reasoned against o Ministers as no Ministers, because they h their calling from *Rome*; and now you w make them no Ministers, because they had Calling from *Rome*. (How shall they plea you and them too?) But what have you fu her to say?

Pop.
nswer
n your
ift, E
nd An
familis
would t
turn to
perfect
Prot
Are di
Church
Pop
Church
here t
so was
while
pollo;
Pauls
nied t
Pro
such
Heath
the P
Pop
Pro
to def
were
their
But
pray
Fathe
nor tal
Pop
her se

Pop

Pop. *I have this further (which is indeed unanswerable) namely, the horrible divisions of, and in your Churches: Here is* Lutheran *and* Calvinist, Episcopal *and* Presbyterian, Independent *and* Anabaptist, *and* Quaker *and* Socinian, *and* Familist; *and what not? so that a man that would turn to your Church, knows not which to turn to: but our Church is one and entire, at perfect unity in it self.*

Prot. I pray you tell me in the first place, Are divisions a certain Argument to prove any Church not to be true?

Pop. *I cannot say so; for it is plain, the Jewish Church in Christs time was full of Divisions; there were Pharisees, Sadduces, Essenes,* &c. *And so was the Church of* Corinth *in St.* Paul's *time, while some said,* I am of Paul; *others,* I of Apollo; *others,* I of Cephas; *and some denied* Pauls *Ministry and Apostleship, and some denied the Resurrection.*

Prot. Very well, then you may blush to use such an Argument; I am told that the old Heathens did use this very Argument against the Primitive Christians.

Pop. *It is true, they did.*

Prot. What a shame is it that you are forced to defend your Cause with such Weapons as were used by the Pagans, and wrested out of their hands by the ancient Fathers?

But besides, you talk of our Divisions, I pray you let me ask you, will you allow me to Father all the opinions of every Papist I read or talk with, upon your Church?

Pop. *No, in no wise; Let our Church speak for her self. It is one great fault of your Ministers they*

they catch up every particular Opinion of any private Doctor, and presently charge our Church with it; tho it be such as she hath condemned, whereas they should judg of our Church only by her own Decrees and Councils.

Prot. Very well, I desire only the same justice from you; Do not father upon our Church those Opinions which she dislikes and abhors. *Socinians, Quakers,* &c. are yours rather than ours, and joyn with you in abundance of your Doctrines; Judg of our Churches by our publick Confessions, and there also you will find, that our Divisions are generally inconsiderable, being almost all about a form of Government, or oft-times, but a manner of Profession, and none of them in Fundamental Points. But since you talk of Divisions, let me ask you, Are all the Members of your Church of one mind? I have been told otherwise, and hear great talk every day of the difference between the Jansenists, and the Jesuits; and (tho I may believe either of them) it is a Fundamental difference, and such as concerns the very Life of Religion. I will not trouble you with other things; But are you agreed in that, which is the Foundation of your Unity, I mean, Concerning the supream Infallible Judg of Controversies? I remember your self told me, that some of you thought it was the Pope, and others a Council. And I have read, that Particular Nations, and Universities, and Doctors, are altogether divided about it; and for the Pope, I have heard that *Bellarmine* reckons up several Opinions, and amongst others, that the Pope (if he be without a General Coun-

may be an Heretick and teach Hereſie; and this (ſaith he) is the Opinion of divers Papiſts, and is determined by a Pope himſelf, Adrian the 6th by name in his queſtion about Confirmation; is this trne, or is *Bellarmine* be-ly'd?

Pop. *It is true,* Bellarmine *doth ſay ſo much;* * *and moreover, that* this opinion is not Heretical, and is tolerated by the Church; *but withall he tells you, that he is of another opinion, which is alſo the common opinion.*

Prot. However, that is ſufficient for my purpoſe; this one difference among you, being far more conſiderable than all thoſe points wherein Proteſtants differ among themſelves; for tho they differ in other and leſſer things, they all agree in this great means of Union, that they own the Holy Scriptures to be the *Judg* (or more properly the *Rule*) of Controverſies; and therefore if you pleaſe, let this paſs, and let me hear what further you have to ſay againſt us, for your ſelves?

Pop. *This further I ſay, the true Church muſt needs remain viſible perpetually to the end of the World, ſuch our Church hath been; whereas yours was inviſible, and (as I ſaid before) unheard of in the World till* Luther's *days.*

Prot. I do not well underſtand you; do you think the Church muſt needs be viſible at all times to the whole World?

Pop. *I cannot ſay ſo, for ſhe was not always viſible to many great and famous parts of the world,* as China, *and* America; *it may ſuffice, that ſhe is viſible in ſome kingdom or part of the world;*

* *De Pontific.* l. 4. c. 2.

and

and that she remains so in all ages.

Prot. Then the Church may remain invi
to the greatest part of the world, and so
Argument reacheth but a small part of Wo
How I pray you must the Church be alw
visible?

Pop. *There must be in all ages, in some emi
place, a great company of Christians visibly
ted together in the worship of God in one
and Congregation, and governed by their su
sive Pastors under the Pope.*

Prot. Very well; Now I know your m
And first I deny, that it is necessary for
true Church to be so visible in all ages
you prove it.

Pop. *That I shall easily prove, from those
and glorious promises made to the Church;
Church is called a great* Mountain, *and said
exalted above other Mountains, Isa.* 2. *She
City set upon a hill that cannot be hid, Ma
Christ hath promised* to be with her to the
of the World, *Mat.*28. The gates of Hell
not prevail against her. Christs Kingdom
an everlasting Kingdom, *Psal.* 88. *Dan* 2.
*few invisible and dispersed Christians, ca
make a Kingdom.*

Prot. Your Proofs are impertinent; *Isa.*
doth prove, that the Church under the
Testament, should be glorious (that is spi
ally) and prevalent; so it was (and we
will be; but he saith not, the Church sh
always continue in that condition (which
the point that you should prove). *Mat.* 5.
spake of the Chrch, Christ only tells us
the Church then was, not that it should al
re

emain such: besides, he speaks of their duty, ot their condition; and *Matt.* 28. proves, that hrist will be with his Church, but not so as at it shall always be illustrious and united in great body; this, neither that, nor any of our other Texts prove, nor can you. But ppose that Christ had made such a promise, hat his Church should be visible in all ages a considerable body; how do you prove hat our Church hath not been so visible in all ges?

Pop. *If you affirm that it hath been visible in all Ages, you are bound to produce a Catalogue of your Churches in all successive Ages.*

Prot. That is not necessary neither; If I did positively affirm that our Church had been visible in such manner in all ages, then I confess am bound to prove it. But if I leave it in doubt as a thing which (for ought you or I know) might be true or false, he that affirms it was not so, is bound to make it good; and if I deny your Proposition, by all Laws of disputе, you must prove it; I will shew by an instance, how unconvincing your argument is; There are several Prophesies and Promises in Scripture, the execution whereof is not Recorded there, nor any where else; suppose an Atheist comes to you, and offers this argument gainst the Scripture, If the Scripture be true, nd the Word of God, then all its Prophesies nd Promises were accomplisht; but there are everal Prophesies and Promises there which never were accomplished within the time appointed, therefore it is not true: What would you answer?

Pop. *I would deny this propoſition,* viz. *there are any ſuch Propheſies or Promiſes which were not accompliſht.*

Prot. Suppoſe then he urge it thus, If were accompliſht, then you muſt ſhew and how they were accompliſht either in Scripture or other ſtories; if you cannot, I conclude they never were accompliſht.

Pop *I ſhould tell him, that he is obliged to they were not accompliſht: nor do I ſhew that were accompliſht: I ſhould tell him that they be accompliſht, tho the accompliſhment of were never put into any writing (and being Hiſtorical Tradition, might eaſily be loſt) or were put into writing, that alſo might be lo the injury of time, as thouſands of other books been, ſo that no prudent man will believe mad Propoſition, that nothing was done in for Ages, that was not mentioned in the Rec which we have. But if it were poſſible that particular things were not recorded, or were yet it is not probable that ſo eminent and pub a matter as a ſucceſſion of Churches ſhould lye*

Prot. I confeſs it is not ſo probable that large and glorious Church ſhould ſo lye hi but ſince it was ſufficient for the making go of Chriſts Promiſe of being ever with Church; If there were ſome few Congrega ons and Miniſters, though ſcattered in div places, that theſe ſhould not be Recorded, not at all ſtrange nor improbable to any who conſiders, 1. How many matters of greater note are Recorded only in ſome ſing Author, which if he had been loſt (and th he was as liable to, as they that were loſt

he memory of those things had perished with im. 2. How wofully dark and ignorant some ges of the Church were, as you all confess, herein there was not much reading; but o be sure, there was little or no writing, and hat little was written, was written by men of he times, who would not do their Enemies hat Honour or Right to put them into their Histories. 3. If any did mention such things, it is not at all improbable, that such Book or Books wherein they were Recorded, might either be lost by the injury of time, (as thousands of other Books were) which was much more easie before Printing was found out, or suppressed by the tyranny of your Predecessors, who made it their business, (as *Israels* enemies of old) that the name and remembrance of true Christians might be blotted out of the earth. So then, if Christ did indeed Promise the perpetual Visibility of his Church, I will conclude he made it good, though History be silent in the Point; nor will I conclude it was not done, because it is not recorded: But I pray you let me further ask you, Is it true that I am told, that in the former Ages, there were many Christians and Ministers whom your Church did persecute and burn for Hereticks?

Pop. *That cannot be denied.*

Prot. This shews there were not wanting even in former Ages, some that testified against your Corruptions; and this was a sign they were the true Church, (whose office it is *to contend for the Faith delivered to the Saints*) for these things were not done in a corner. I am

told that your great *Bellarmine*, when it was o-jected against him, that the Church was obscu in St. *Hillaries* days, answers, that *tho the* t *Church may be obscure by multitude of Scand yet even then it is visible in its strongest me bers, as then it was in* Athanasius, Hillary, E sebius, and two or three more whom he me tions: * Whence I gather, that some few e nent Preachers and Professors of the Truth, sufficient to keep up this Visibility: I remem I have read in the History of the *Walden* who (tho your Predecessors branded th with odious Names and Opinions, yet) do s ficiently appear to have been a company Orthodox and serious Christians, and inde true Protestants; these began about 500 ye ago, saith your *Genebrard* *; and your *Rei rius*, who was one of their cruel Butche (otherwise called Inquisitors) writeth thus them; *This Sect* (saith he) *is the most per cious of all others, for three causes.* 1. *Because is of long continuance, some say that it hath dured from the time of* Sylvester; *others from time of the Apostles. The 2d is, because it is m general, for there is almost no land in which th Sect doth not creep.* 3. *That whereas all othe by the immanity of their blasphemies against G do make men abhor them, these have a gre shew of godliness, because they do live justly fore men, and believe all things well of God, a all the Articles which are contained in the Cree only the Church of* Rome *they do blasphe*

* *De Ecclesia militante, l. 3. c. 16.* * *Chr*

and hate. Behold here out of your own mouths a plain confutation of your objection, and a teſtimony of the perpetuity, amplitude, viſibility, and ſanctity of our Church: for it is ſufficiently known that our Church and Doctrine is for ſubſtance the ſame with theirs. Now tell me, I pray you, if this Hiſtory of them had been loſt, and no other mention of them made in other Records, Had it been a truth for you to affirm, that there never were any ſuch men and Churches in that time?

Pop. *No ſurely, for the recording of things in Hiſtory doth not make them true, nor the ſilence of Hiſtories about true Occurrences, make them falſe.*

Prot. Then there might be the like Companies and Congregations in former ages for ought you or I know; nor can you argue from the defect of an Hiſtory, to the denial of the thing; And all this I ſay, not as if there were no Records which mention our Church in former Ages: (for as I ſaid before, it is ſufficiently evident, that all our material Doctrines have been conſtantly and ſucceſſively owned by a conſiderable number of perſons in ſeveral Ages) but only that you may ſee there is a flaw in the very foundation of your Argument. Moreover, I find in Scripture, ſeveral inſtances of ſuch times when the Church was as much obſcured, and inviſible, as ever our Church was: as when *Iſrael* was in *Egypt*; ſo oft times under the Judges, *Judg.* 2.3. and ſo under divers of the Kings, as *Ahab*, when *Elijah* complained he was left alone, and the 7000 which were reſerved, though known to God, were inviſible

ſible to the Prophet, and under *Ahaz* and alt
Manaſſeh and ſo in the *Babyloniſh* captiv cknow
and ſo under *Antiochus*, read at thy leiſ ll the
2 *Chron.* 15. 3. 28. 24. 29. 6, 7. 33. 3, 4. ſo in hoſe w
New-Teſtament, how obſcure, and in a ma erſe 8
inviſible, was the Chriſtian Church for a ſea Churc
Nay, let me add, This perpetual viſibility at that
ſplendour is ſo far from being a note of tian C
true Church, that on the contrary, it is ra heard
a ſign that yours is not the true Church, time o
appears thus: Chriſt hath foretold the obſc nd al
ty and ſmallneſs of his Church in ſome a Chriſti
Ages; he tells us that there ſhall be a gen ſo?
Apoſtacy and Defection from the Faith, 2 T Pop
2. 1. 1 *Tim.* 4. I read of a Woman, *Rev.* time of
and ſhe is forced to flee into the Wilderne ledget
and I am told your own expoſitors agree w hree y
us, that this is the Church which flees fr Antich
Antichriſt into the Wilderneſs, and ſecret p Pro
ces, withdrawing her ſelf from perſecution exceed
this true? Religi

Pop. *I muſt confeſs our Authors do tak* ſhall
ſo. am ve

Prot. Then it ſeems you do not believe y Trieni
ſelves, when you plead the neceſſity of p and th
petual viſibility and ſplendour: for here ny hu
acknowledg her obſcurity; and really, t 3. and
Place and Diſcourſe of yours does very m famili
confirm me, that the obſcurity which y tical V
object againſt us, is an argument that our ſcured
the true Chnrch; though, according to t three
Prediction, the Pope is Antichriſt, and d Prom
drive our Predeceſſors into the Wilderneſs. make
read of *a Beaſt riſing out of the Sea*, Rev. trow
which your own Authors, *Menochius*, *Teri* you

and almoſt all Expoſitors (as *Riberas* ſaith) acknowledg to be Antichriſt; and this Beaſt *all the inhabitants of the world do worſhip, except thoſe whoſe names are written in the Book of Life*, verſe 8. that is, excepting only the Inviſible Church: if any Church be viſible and glorious at that time, it muſt be the falſe and Antichriſtian Church; and now I ſpeak of that, I have heard that you your ſelves confeſs, that in the time of Antichriſt, the Church ſhall be obſcure, and all publick worſhip in the Churches of Chriſtians, ſhall be forbidden and ceaſe; Is it ſo?

Pop. *It is true, it ſhall be ſo*, i. e. *during the time of Antichriſts reign, as* Bellarmine *acknowledgeth; but that is only for a ſhort moment, for three years and a half, which is all the time that Antichriſt ſhall reign.*

Prot. I thank you for this, for now you have exceedingly confirmed me in the truth of my Religion; for ſince you grant that the Church ſhall be obſcure during Antichriſts reign, I am very well aſſured that your opinion of the Trienial reign of Antichriſt, is but a dream, and that he was to reign in the Church for many hundred of years, for 1260 *days*, *Rev.* 11. 3. and 12. 6. (that is, *years*, it being a very familiar thing to put *days* for *years*, in Prophetical Writings). But if the Church may be obſcured for three *years*, why not for thirty, yea, three hundred? Did Chriſt in his ſuppoſed Promiſe of perpetual viſibility in the Church, make an exception for theſe three *years*? I trow not; and tell me, I pray you, ſhould you live till that time when Antichriſt ſhall

prevail, and your Religion no leſs than our obſcure and inviſible; if any of the follow of Antichriſt ſhould diſpute againſt you, yours was not the true Church, becauſe not ſible, would you grant it?

Pop. *God forbid I ſhould be ſo wicked to my Mother, and Church, becauſe of her Affli*

Prot. Then I ſee you your ſelves do not lieve this to be a good argument, and that do not make perpetual viſibility a neceſ token of the true Church. To this I add, th is no need we ſhould ſhew a conſtant ſucceſ of Proteſtant Churches ever ſince the Apo days, (as you pretend is neceſſary) the ſucceſ that you pretend in your Church, is ſuffici for ours; and ſo long as we generally ag that your Church was a true Church (till la years) though wofully corrupted, and Predeceſſors continued in it, till your wou ſtunk and became incurable, we need no ot ſucceſſion than yours; but when your imp came to the height, then we viſibly depar from you, and have given ſuch reaſons fo as you will never be able to anſwer. In mean time let me hear what you have furth to ſay.

Pop *For as much as all your Miniſters con our Church was once a true Church, I pray you me how, and when ſhe did fall? you cannot t either the time when ſhe fell, or the manner ho by Apoſtacy, or Hereſie, or Schiſm: if you ca name your Authors.*

Prot. This is a moſt unreaſonable deman A Friend of mine had the Plague laſt ye and died of it, I askt him when he was ſick ho

how and when he got it? he ſaid, he knew not: Shall I then conclude he had it not? ſhall I make Chriſt a Lyar, and diſpute that there were no tares, becauſe they were *ſown when men ſlept*, Mat. 13. 25, and ſo could not know when or how they came? Shall I believe no Hereſie to be an Hereſie, unleſs I can ſhew how and when it came into the Church? What if the Records of theſe things by the injury of time are loſt, and their original left in obſcurity: ſhall I therefore ſay, it is now become no Hereſie? I beſeech you anſwer me freely this queſtion: Suppoſe I could bring plain and ſtrong evidences from the holy Scripture, and from ancient Tradition, or the unanimous teſtimonies of the Ancient Fathers, that your Doctrine of Merits (for inſtance) is an Hereſie; your doctrine of worſhipping Images is Idolatry, and that you are in divers particulars apoſtatized from that Faith which the Scriptures and Fathers do own: in this cauſe, would you not confeſs, that you are guilty of Idolatry, Hereſie, and Apoſtacy?

Pop. *If it were ſo, and you could really bring (as you falſly pretend you can, but indeed cannot) any ſuch ſolid proofs, I muſt and will confeſs it: For all our writers agree, that although we muſt believe many things that are not contained in the Scripture, yet we muſt believe nothing contrary to the Scriptures, nor to the conſent of the ancient Fathers.*

Prot. Very well; hence then I gather, that the only queſtion between you and me is, Whether we can evidently and ſolidly prove the particulars now mentioned, which if we

can do, as I am ſatisfied our Miniſters ha
done, you are convicted in your own Conſcien
and will confeſs your ſelf and your Chur
guilty of Hereſie, Idolatry, and Apoſtacy, wheth
I can tell the manner, or time, or Authors
this Doctrine, or no.

Therefore leaving theſe frivolous and impe
tinent queſtions, let me hear what you have
ſay more againſt our Religion; and where
your diſcourſe I obſerve hath wholly run up
Generals, I beſeech you come to ſome partic
lars, and ſhew me the falſhood of the Doctrin
of our Church. But it doth not a little confir
me in my Religion, that you confeſs (a
ſhewed before) moſt of our Doctrines to
true and grounded upon Scripture, where
yours are additions of your own deviſing. No
if things be thus, you ſhall not need to troub
your ſelf about many particulars; but if yo
pleaſe, ſingle out ſome of our principal Hereſie
(as you call them) and let me hear what ev
dences you can bring againſt them.

Pop. *Your Hereſies are very many; but I ſha
mention one, which may be inſtead of all, and tha
is your Rule of Faith and Judg of controverſie
which you make to be the Scripture only.*

Prot. I am glad you have fallen upon ſo
material a point, the deciding whereof ma
make other Diſputes in great part uſeleſs. Tel
me then what you have to ſay againſt thi
Doctrine.

Pop. *I will urge four Arguments againſt it
1. Scripture hath no Authority over us, but from
the Church. 2. You cannot know what Books are*

the Holy Scriptures, or part of it, but by the Churches Report. 3. *If neither of these were true, yet Scripture is not a sufficient rule for your Faith, without Tradition.* 4 *If it were sufficient, yet it is so obscure, that you cannot know the sense of it without the interpretation of the Church. You see here is a fourfold cord, which you will find is not easily broken.*

Prot. Make these things good, and I confess you do your work in a great measure. Let me hear your Proofs.

Pop. *For the first then, I say, that Scripture hath no Authority over us but from the Church; neither you nor I are bound to believe the Scripture to be the word of God, nor can any man know it or prove it to be so, but from the testimony of our Church concerning it.*

Prot. I pray tell me if you were to discourse with an Atheist, who utterly denies the Holy Scriptures, and the Church too, Could you not prove against him that the Scriptures are the Word of God?

Pop. *God forbid but that I should be able to defend the truth of the Scriptures against any adversary whatsoever.*

Prot. How then I pray you would you prove it?

Pop. *I need not tell you the Arguments which in this case our Doctors use, and I stand by them in it; they alledg for the truth of the holy Scriptures, the testimony of all ages & all sorts of persons, the miracles wrought for it, acknowledg'd even by the enemies of it, the martyrdom that so many thousands (and many of them wise and learned men) did run upon in the defence of them, tho living so*

near the time of the writing of them, were a to discern the truth, and the wonderful po that goes along with them in convincing, c verting, and comforting or terrifying sinners.

Prot. Do you believe these are solid Arg ments, and that the Atheist ought to yield them?

Pop. *Yes doubtless, for every man is bound receive the truth, especially when it is so propo and proved to him.*

Prot. It seems then by this, when you h you can prove the Scripture to be the Word God without taking in the Churches Authori I hope you will allow me the same benefit. B again let me ask you, Your Church, that y talk of, which believes the Scripture to be t word of God; Doth she believe it to be t Word of God upon solid grounds, or no?

Pop. *Yes doubtless, our Church is not so irr tional as to believe without grounds; nor do pretend Revelation; but she believes it upo solid Arguments.*

Prot. I wish you would give me a list o their Arguments; But whatever they be the are sufficient to convince your Church, wh should they not be sufficient to convince an private man, Popish, or Protestant, or Atheist? And therefore there is no need of the Churche testimony. Or will you say, the Church hath no other sufficient reason to believe the Scriptures but her own testimony, *that is*, she believes because she will believe?

Pop. *God forbid that I should disparage the Church, or give Atheists that occasion to scoff at the Scripture.*

Prot.

Prot. Then I alſo may be ſatisfied without the Churches teſtimony, that the Scriptures are the Word of God; and I am ſo, by ſuch Arguments as your ſelf mentioned; but really I cannot but ſmile to ſee what cunning Sophiſters you are, how you play at faſt and looſe; The ſame Arguments for the Scriptures are ſtrong and undeniable when you talk with an Atheiſt, and are all of a ſudden become weak as Water when a Proteſtant brings them.

Pop. *But if you can prove in the general, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, yet you cannot without the Churches Authority, tell what Books are Scripture, or which are Canonical, and ſo you are never the nearer.*

Prot. Here alſo I muſt ask you again; How doth your Church know which Books are Scripture and Canonical? Doth ſhe know this by Revelation?

Pop. *No, we leave ſuch fancies to your Church.*

Prot How then doth ſhe know this? and why doth ſhe determine it? Is it with reaſon or without it?

Pop. *With Reaſon, doubtleſs, being induced to believe and determine it upon clear and undoubted Evidence?*

Prot. I pray you tell me what are thoſe Evidences upon which ſhe goes?

Pop. *I will be true to you, our great* Bellarmine *mentions theſe three,* The Church *(ſaith he)* knows and declares a Canonical Book, 1. From the teſtimonies of the Ancients. 2. From its likeneſs and agreement with other Books. 3. From

3. From the common ſenſe and taſte of Ch
ſtian people *.

Prot. Since a private man (eſpecially o
that beſides Learning and Experience, hath t
Spirit of God to guide him, which is th
anointing given to all Believers, which teach
them all things, 1 *Joh* 2. 27.) may exami
and apprehend theſe things as well as the Po
himſelf, (and better too, conſidering wh
kind of creatures divers of your Popes a
confeſt to have been) he may therefore kno
without the Churches Authority, what Boo
are indeed Canonical; But I pray you tell m
Do not you acknowledg thoſe Books to be t
Word of God which we do, that are in th
Bible?

Pop. *I muſt be true to you, we do own eve
Book you have there; but you ſhould receive t
Books which you call Apocryphal; ſo that inde
your Bible is not compleat, for you believe but
part of the written Word of God, which I mu
tell you is of dangerous conſequence.*

Prot. If theſe Books be a part of Gods Wor
I confeſs we are guilty of a great ſin, in takin
away from Gods Word; and if they be no
you are no leſs guilty in adding to it; ſo th
the only queſtion is, Whether theſe Books b
a part of the Holy Scripture or no; Now i
you pleaſe, we will try *Bellarmines* rules.

Pop. *The Motion is fair and reaſonable.*

Prot. Firſt then, for the Judgment of th
Ancient Church, let us try that; I know yo
hold the Churches Judgment Infallible, e

* *De Verbo Dei*, l. 1. c. 10. *Itaq; non decim*
pecial

pecially in matters of this moment; and I ſuppoſe you think the *Jewiſh* Church was infallible before Chriſt, as the Chriſtian Church now is.

Pop. *We do ſo, and the Infallibility of the Jewiſh Church and high Prieſt*, Deut. 17. *is one of our Principal Arguments for the Infallibility of our Church.* (a)

Prot. Then only theſe Books of the Old Teſtament were Canonical, which the *Jewiſh* Church did own.

Pop. *That muſt neceſſarily follow.*

Prot. Then your cauſe is loſt; for it is certain, the Jews rejected theſe Apocryphal Books which you receive; and they reckoned only 22. *Joſephus* his words (acknowledged for *his* by *Euſebius*, (b) are moſt expreſs for us, *The Jews have only 22 Books, to which they deſervedly give credit, which contains things written from the beginning of the World to the times of* Artaxerxes; *other things were written afterward* (ſo the Apocryphal Books are granted to have been) *but they are not of the ſame credit with the former, becauſe there was no certain ſucceſſion of Prophets*; (c) and I am told divers of your learned Authors confeſs it, as *Catharinus*, (d) *Coſterus* (e) *Marianus Victor*, (f) and *Bellarmine* himſelf, whoſe words are theſe; *All thoſe Books which the Proteſtants do not receive, the*

(a) See *Nullity of Rom. faith, ch.* 2. (b) *Hiſt. l.* 3. 10. (c) *Contra Appionem*, lib. 1. (d) *In Annot. adverſus Cajet. de libris Maccab.* (e) *Enchir. c. de ſcrip. de num. lib.* (f) *In Scholiis ad Epiſt.* 116. *Hieronymi.*

Jews

Jews also did not receive: (*g*) And this is no considerable, because *to the Jews were committed the Oracles of God*, Rom. 3. 2. And neither Christ nor his Apostles did accuse them of breach of trust in this matter. Moreover I am told (and surely in all reason it must needs be true) that the Canonical Books of the *Jewish* Church were written in the *Jewish* or *Hebrew* Language, whereas these were written in *Greek* only. Are these things so?

Pop. *What is true I will acknowledg*; but *so*; *The* Jewish *Church indeed did not receive them, nor yet did they reject them as our* Canon *well answers* (*h*).

Prot. Either that Church did believe them to be Canonical, or they did *not*; if they did, then they liveed in a mortal sin against Conscience in not receiving them; if they did not, they were of our opinion.

Pop. *Well, whatsoever the* Jewish *Church did, I am sure the ancient Christians and Fathers did receive these Books as a part of the Canonical Scripture.*

Prot. I doubt I shall take you tardy there too; I am told that the Council of *Laodicea* (in the year of our Lord 364) drew up a Catalogue of the Books of the Scripture, in which (as in ours) the Apocryphal Books are rejected.

Pop. *It is true, they did not receive them, nor yet reject them.*

Prot. If they did not receive them, that un-

(*g*) *De Verbo Dei*, l. 1. c. 10. *In principio.* (*h*) *Lic. Theol.* l. 2. c. 11.

deniable

deniably ſhews that they did not believe them to be Canonical, and yet they diligently ſcanned the point, and the Books had then been extant ſome hundreds of Years, and they were far more likely to know the Truth than we at this diſtance, having then ſuch ſpecial opportunities of knowing the Judgment of the ancient Church, both *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian*; beſides, I am informed that the famous Biſhop of *Sardis*, *Melito*, (a man of great Judgment and Venerable Holineſs, as your *Sixtus Sinenſis* ſaid) did take a journey to the Eaſtern Churches (where the Apoſtles principally Preached) to find out the true Canon of the Scripture, and returned with the ſame Canon that we own; but for the Apocrypha, brought home a *Non eſt inventus*; And moreover, that divers of your greateſt Champions do confeſs, that a great number of the Ancient Fathers were of our opinion, among which themſelves reckon *Melito*, *Origen*, *Athanaſius*, *Euſebius*, *Ruffinus*, *Hierom* and *Amphilotius*; ſo ſay *Canus*, and *Bellarmine*, and *Andradius*; and in the general, *Sixtus Sinenſis* confeſſeth, that the *Ancient Fathers were of our opinion.* Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *I will not deny the truth, it is ſo; but you muſt know, that other Fathers were of another mind, as* Clemens, Cyprian, *and* Ambroſe: *and eſpecially St.* Auſtin *and the Council of* Carthage.

Prot. The Fathers of our opinion, were both far more numerous, and ſuch as lived neareſt the Apoſtolical Times and Churches: The Council of *Laodicea* was more ancient than that of *Carthage* (and therefore of greater Authority); and beſides, the ſixth Council of *Conſtantinople*

ſtantinople doth expreſly confirm all the D
crees of the Council of *Laodicea*, (among
which this was one); and the Council of Ca
thage too, doth not your work: For in the
Catalogue there is both more than you own
to wit, the third Book of *Eſdras* (although
they call it the ſecond, as the *Greeks* did); an
leſs too, for they ſhut out *Baruch* and the Ma
cabees. But beſides all this, I am told, th
very many of your moſt eminent Doctors hav
diſowned theſe Books which we reject, as th
Pariſian Divines, and Cardinal *Xominus*, wi
the *Complutenſiam* Univerſity, and *Aquinas*, an
Lyca, and *Pagnim* and many other. Is it ſo

Pop. *I confeſs this is true* *.

Prot. Then I am ſure this may ſatisfie an
rational man, concerning the Teſtimony o
the Ancient Church; and for the next poin
viz. their agreement with the Canonical Book
I think it is plain enough that they do groſſ
contradict them, and the Truth too; that fac
of *Simeon* and *Levi*, which good *Jacob* (acted by
Gods Spirit) deteſteth, *Judith* commends, *Cha*
14; whereas if he ſaid true, he muſt have live
twice as long, for he ſaid he was taken cap
tive by *Salmanaſſer*, Chap. 1. and 2. and 14
and when he was about to dye, he ſaith, th
time was near for the return of the *Iſraelite*
from the Captivity, and the rebuilding of th
Temple which was burn'd; If the Books of th

---

* *Rainoldus* in his Prelections concerning the
Apocryphal Books, proves this out of their own
words, ſee *Prælect.* 40. 41, 42, 43.

Macca
Leaſe
killed
he was
1. He
then h
1. La
out of
fetche
contra
heard
tlema
at one
der le
put t
not l
Abſur
theſe
witho
it is
that
Book
with
Po
grant
are t
Pr
or i
have
Po
Pr
tran

*See

Maccabees

Maccabees ſay true, *Antiochus* his Soul had a Leaſe of his body for three Lives, and he was killed thrice over (I commend the Author, he was reſolved to make ſure work of him). 1. He dyes at *Babylon* in his Bed, 1 *Mac.* 2. 6. then he is ſtoned in the Temple of *Nanea*, 2 *Mac.* 1. Laſtly, he dyes in the Mountains by a fall out of his Chariot, 2 *Mac.* 9. And the fine fetches of your Authors to reconcile theſe groſs contradictions, put me in mind of a ſtory we heard at School (if you remember) of a Gentleman that told this lye *, That he ſhot a Deer at one ſhot through his right ear, and left hinder leg, and you know how hard his man was put to it, to help his Maſter out. But I will not lanch forth into the Sea of Untruths and Abſurdities that are contained in thoſe Books; theſe may ſuffice to ſhew you, that we do not without warrant reject them; but howſoever it is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that you grant that my Bible is the Word of God, and theſe Books in it Canonical, and I can know this without the Churches Authority.

Pop. *Do not make too much haſte; If I do grant that theſe Books in the Original language are the word of God, yet yours is but a tranſlation.*

Prot. Is it rightly tranſlated for the ſubſtance, or is it not? What Bible is that which you have?

Pop. *A Latin Bible?*

Prot. Is that the Word of God, and rightly tranſlated?

---

*See *Rainoldus & Spanhem. de libris Apocryphis.*

Pop.

Pop. *Yes, the Council of* Trent *hath decr so.*

Prot. Then I pray you let us try this Exp riment; do you pick out any 20 Verses in veral parts of the Bible, and turn them i Engliſh out of your Bible.

Pop. *The motion is fair, I will do it.*

Prot. I do not find any ſubſtantial differe in all theſe places between your Tranſlat and mine; the difference is wholly in wor not at all in ſenſe; ſo now, I thank you for t occaſion, for I have heard ſome of your Pri ranting highly againſt our Tranſlation; a now I ſee they have no cauſe for it.

Pop. *If all this were over, yet the Scriptur not a ſufficient Rule to guide you to Heaven of ſelf, without Tradition.*

Prot. Why ſo, I beſeech you?

Pop. *Becauſe you are alſo commanded them hold the Tradition; Turn in your Bible to* 2 Th 2.15 Hold the Traditions which you have be taught, whether by Word or Epiſtle.

Prot. How do you prove that he ſpeaks ſuch Traditions as were not written in t Scripture?

Pop. *Becauſe he ſo plainly diſtinguiſheth b tween what he taught them by Word, and wh he taught them by Epiſtle or Writing.*

Prot. That may be true that he ſpeaks ſome things of which he had not written t them, and yet they might be written by hi to others, or by others, at leaſt after that time but beſides, notwithſtanding this diſtinctio between Word and Epiſtle, divers of you own Authors affirm, that Tradition is perfect

and

and that St. *Paul* taught all things neceſſary by word of mouth; and why may not I as well ſay, that he taught all by Epiſtle? But I pray you, what do you mean by theſe traditions?

Pop. *I mean all the Traditions which either he, or any other Apoſtle did deliver: all theſe you are bound to receive.*

Prot. I will not quarrel with you for that; bring me ſolid proofs of any of your unwritten Traditions, that they did indeed come from the Apoſtles, I promiſe you I will joyfully receive them: But I pray you, what are theſe Traditions you ſpeak of?

Pop. *Such as theſe, The Doctrine of Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, of the Popes Supremacy, of the ſingle life of Prieſts, of the Faſts of the Church, Private Maſſes, worſhip of Images,* &c.

Prot. And do you think that all that did not believe and receive theſe Traditions, ſhall be damned?

Pop. *No, by no means; for then I ſhould condemn many of the Holy Fathers and Martyrs, who differed from us at leaſt in ſome of theſe Points.*

Prot. Then it is not neceſſary to ſalvation to receive theſe Traditions; and the Scripture may be ſufficient without them: But further, Theſe unwritten Traditions you talk of, I beſeech you how came you to diſcover them, and diſcern the true from the falſe?

Pop. *I altogether approve of* Bellarmin's *rule, which is this,* That (*ſaith he*) is a true Tradition on which all former Doctors have ſucceſſively in their ſeveral Ages acknowledged to come from the Apoſtles, and by their Doctrine or Practices have approved, and which the Univerſal

verſal Church owneth as ſuch; and the rea
is, becauſe the Univerſal Church cannot err

Prot. I ſee all depends upon this Founda
on, that the Catholick Church (in your ſen
cannot err; which, having diſproved, I ne
not trouble my ſelf further: to wave that, He
I pray you do you know what former Doct
have ſucceſſively owned by word or practic
I preſume none of your Popes have ſo good
memory as to remember all that hath be
ſaid or done in former ages, tho in my opini
when your inventions were upon the Whe
and you did confer upon the Pope an infalli
Judgment, you ſhould have given him alſo
alſufficient memory, and then you had do
your work.

Pop. *No Sir, we pretend no ſuch thing: W
we know this from the writings which the D
ctors have left. It is true,* Bellarmine *menti
another rule, which is* the continual uſage
the Church in all ages; *but to deal candi
with you, I cannot know what their uſe was
by their writings; ſo all muſt come to that.*

Prot. Firſt, then I note, you forſake yo
cauſe, and it ſeems a writing is now made
rule for your unwritten Traditions; if it m
be ſo, let me beg your favourable opinion
the Apoſtles writings; Beſides, thoſe Writ
which record theſe Traditions, were they i
fallible?

Pop. N*, we do not hold any particular writ

---

* *De Tradit.* cap. 9.

Infallible, especially not in matters of Fact, such as reporting a Tradition or use of the Church, undoubtedly is.

Prot. Then they might mistake false Traditions for true: Besides, how can I tell what the Ancient Doctors did agree in, since most of them never wrote; and many of their writings are lost; and yet all of them had equal liberty of voting in this case? besides, I have heard that divers of the Ancient Fathers did report several things to be Apostolical Traditions which your Church now rejecteth, as *that Infants should receive the Communion, and that Christ should reign on earth a thousand years,* and many others: I am told also, that your great *Baronius,* writing concerning the Apostles, professeth, *He despairs to find out the truth, even in those matters which true writers have recorded; because there was nothing which remained sincere and uncorrupted.* Is it so?

Pop. *You shall find me ingenuous; it is so:* Baronius *saith it, Anno* 44. *Sect.* 42.

Prot. Then truly I shall bid tradition (in your sense) good night: For as to your Traditions, I see there is no certainty in them. *Shall I forsake the certain and acknowledg'd verity of the Scripture, for such trash?* God forbid.

Again, I pray you tell me, doth not every wise man that makes any thing, make it sufficient for its end? If you build an house to live in, will you not make it sufficient for that end? If a man makes a Sword to cut with, a Coat of Male to defend him, *&c.* is he not a Fool if he doth not, if he can, make them sufficient for their end and use?

Pop.

Pop. *That muſt needs be granted.*

Prot. And was not our Inſtruction and Salvation the end for which God wrote the Scripture?

Pop. *How do you prove that it was?*

Prot. God himſelf tells me ſo, *John* 20. *These things are written, that you may believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing, you might have life through his Name.*

Pop. St. John *ſpeaks there of Miracles, not Doctrines, and ſo that is nothing to the purpoſe.*

Prot. He ſpeaks of Miracles, which were done in confirmation of the Doctrine of Chriſt, and ſo the Doctrine is not to be excluded: beſides, I ſuppoſe you will not ſay that St. John wrote the Doctrines of Chriſt for one end, and the Miracles for another: Moreover, it plainly appears, both that this was the end for which the Scripture was written, and that is ſufficient for its end, from that 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16, where he ſaith expreſly, *The Scriptures are able to make a man of God wiſe unto ſalvation* *.

Pop. *Well, but if all theſe things be ſo, yet ſince the Scripture is dark and doubtful, and you can never apprehend the true meaning of it but from the Church, you are never the nearer, and the Scripture is not a convenient judg of controverſies.*

Prot. Tell me, I pray, doth your Church understand the true meaning of the Scripture?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs, becauſe ſhe hath the Spirit of God.*

Prot. Then certainly ſhe is moſt deep

* Of which ſee *Nullity*, Append. p 92.

guil

guilty of uncharitableneſs, or envy, or cruelty to Souls, that She doth not put forth a clear and infallible Comment upon the whole Scripture; but ſtill ſuffers the whole World to live in Contention about the true meaning of hundreds of Texts of Scripture.

Pop. *She forbears that, for reaſons beſt known to her ſelf. But this is not much to the purpoſe.*

Prot. Whereas you pretend your Church certainly knows the true Senſe of the Scripture, and this Church you ſay is the Pope, or a Council; and if theſe be infallible, you ſay they are ſo in their Decrees: If this be ſo, how comes it to paſs that none do more groſly miſtake, and miſ apply Scripture, than divers of your Popes and Councils have done, even in their Decrees, and decretal Epiſtles (which you reverence as the Goſpel)? Your Pope *Nicolas* the Firſt, proves the Supremacy from that Text, *Ariſe* Peter, *kill and eat*; Small encouragement to us to become his Sheep, if he ſo uſe them; and from hence, that Peter *drew to the ſhore his Net full of Fiſhes:* your Pope *Boniface* the Eighth proves it from *Gen.*1.1. *In the beginning God created Heaven and Earth*; 'therefore the 'Pope hath power in Temporals and Spirituals; 'and this(*ſaith he*) you muſt hold,unleſs with the 'Manachees you hold two Principles. And your Councils are not more happy Expoſitors. The Council of *Lateran* proves the Popes power from *Pſal.* 72. (which ſpeaks of *Solomon* and Chriſt) *All Kings ſhall fall down before him.* The ſecond Council of *Nice* alledges theſe Scriptures for the Worſhip of Images, that *God created man in his own Image*, Gen. 1. *Let me ſee thy*

countenance. Cant. 2. *No man when he hath lighted a Candle covereth it under a vessel,* Luk. 8. In my opinion they spoke like a Council, expecting that the World should receive their Decrees, nor for any Solidity of Argument (that had been pedantick) but merely for the Churches Majesty and Authority; nay, the Jest is, when their Adversaries had taken notice of these absurd Impertinencies, up steps *Pater Noster*, Pope *Adrian*, and he saith, he will maintain it (in spite of fate) that they alledged them rightly and excellently: So here we have a Pope and Council joyning together (and therefore undoubtedly Infallible) in these Expositions. Nay, the Council of *Trent* it self (when one would expect they should have grown wiser, though not better) prove the unequal power of Popes, Bishops and Priests, from 13. 1. *The powers that be, are ordained of God; that is, digested in order.* I hope ere you have done, you will put forth an intire Comment upon the whole Bible, which I assure you will be the rarest Book that ever saw the light. But further, I desire to know of you how your Church comes to have the true and certain sense of Scripture? Hath She it by Revelation, or Inspiration?

Pop. *No, we pretend to no such things; The Church comes to know it by the diligent use of means, by prayer, by reading, and comparing Scripture, by consulting ancient Interpreters, Analogy of Faith, the coherence, &c. and even the Pope himself, when he set forth his Translation of the Bible, He professes to all the World, that he did it in the very same manner, and by the same helps, that other Translators do; that is, by advis-*

advising with learned Men, and consulting ancient Copies, and the like *.

---

* Sixtus *the* Fifth, *Pope, tells us in his Preface to his Translation of the Bible, that* he pickt out of the Cardinals, and almost out of all Nations, a Colledg of most learned Men, who advised him in that work; They *(saith he)* consulted, and I chose that which was best. *And he adds these remarkable words,* It is most evident, that there is no surer, nor stronger Argument, than the comparing of ancient and approved Copies. *And (he tells us) that* he carefully corrected it with his own hands. *And then the Pope imposeth this Translation upon all the World,* to be followed without adding, or diminishing, or altering, under pain of Excommunication. *And yet (that you may see how they abuse the Peoples credulity, to make them believe the Popes Infallibility, which themselves do not in earnest believe:) About two years after, comes* Clement *the Eighth, and he puts forth another Edition and Translation of the Bible, differing from, and contrary to the former Edition, in two Thousand places, as Doctor* James *hath proved, by producing the places, as they are in both Editions. And, which is more than all this, in the preface to the last Bible of* Clement *the Eighth, we have these words*; Receive, Christian Reader, this old and vulgar Edition of the Scripture, corrected with all possible diligence, which tho

* In his *Bellam. Papale*, and defence of it.

in reſpect of human Weakneſs, it be hard affirm, That it is every way compleat; ye is not to be doubted but it is more pure corrected than all that hath gone before it. *think this were ſufficient evidence (if there no other) how great a cheat it is, that you tend the Pope to be the Infallible interpret Scripture. For there we have one of thoſe fallibles directly contradicting and over-tur the other; and beſides, inſtead of that Di (or, after a ſort Divine) Infallibility which aſcribe to the Pope, we have here a publick knowledgment of his Imbecility; nor dar affirm his Work to be perfect, which it needs have been, if he had been infallibly g ed in it (as you pretend he was) nor would have ſaid ſo, if he had believed his own Infa bility.*

Prot. Very good; Then I pray you tell why a Proteſtant Miniſter (being oft times a learneder and better Man than the Pope) not as certainly hit upon the true Senſe of Scripture, as the Pope himſelf?

Pop. *The reaſon is plain, becauſe the Pop guided by the Infallible aſſiſtance of Gods Spir*

Prot. You ought not to rant at this heig until you have ſolidly anſwered what our vines have wrote againſt this Infallibility. I heard before, the woful Weakneſs of your guments; for it is to me the vaineſt thing in World to pretend a promiſe of the Spirit God Infallibly to guide ſuch men as (if the Scr ture be true) have not the Spirit of Chriſt

them, being (as you confeſs many of your Popes and Biſhops were) *ſenſual, not having the Spirit*; and having apparently no other Spirit in them, but the Spirit of the World, the Spirit that luſteth to Envy, and all Wickedneſs, but ſince you pretend the Scripture is ſo dark, I pray you tell me, What was the end for which God deſigned the Scripture? Sure I think it was for our underſtanding; my Bible tells me, that *whatſoever things were written before time, were written for our learning*, Rom. 15. 4. But if you ſay true, it ſeems God means only to put forth Riddles; Gods Law was deſigned by him for *a light, and that even to the ſimple*, Pſal. 19. 7, 8, 9. and 119. 105. And in a word, the Goſpel is ſo clear, that Saint *Paul* pronounceth, *it is hid from none but them that periſh*, 2 Cor. 4. 3, 4. And Saint *Luke* wrote his Goſpel, that *Theophilus* (and with him other Chriſtians) *might know the certainty of thoſe things wherein they had been inſtructed*, Luk. 1. 4. and generally every diſcreet man that writes a Book, writes it ſo, as it may be underſtood; eſpecially, if it be for the benefit of the Ignorant, as well as the learned (which the Scripture aſſuredly was). Tell me then, I pray you, why ſhould God write his mind ſo darkly and doubtfully as you know whoſe Oracles are ſaid to be delivered? Was it becauſe God could not write plainer (and wanteth the gift of utterance), or becauſe he would not?

Pop. *Notwithſtanding all this, it is certain the Scripture is full of obſcure places.*

Prot. I do not deny this; but thoſe things which are obſcurely delivered in one place,

are more clearly delivered in another; and those dark places generally are about Prophecies, and ſuch other things, the knowledg of which is not neceſſary to Salvation. But for neceſſaries, the Scripture is plain, and I am told that divers of your Authors acknowledg ſo much; Is this true?

Pop. *I confeſs* Coſterus *hath this Expreſſion*. That things which are neceſſary to be known by all Chriſtians, are plainly and clearly delivered in the writings of the Apoſtles; *and ſome others of our Doctors ſay as much* ||.

Prot. It could be nothing but the evidence of the truth which forced ſuch an acknowledgment from its greateſt adverſaries: therefore let this go, and let me hear what further you have to ſay againſt our Religion.

Pop. *I find you are an obſtinate Heretick, and ſetled upon the Lees, and therefore it will be needleſs to diſcourſe further with you; if any thing could have convinced you, ſurely the Arguments I have offered would have dont it; for I aſſure you I have pickt out the ſtrength and marrow of the Catholick Cauſe, in the points we have diſcourſed. And ſince I ſee you turn a deaf ear to my Counſel, I ſhall give you over as incorrigible.*

Prot. You ſee I have heard you with great Patience, and given you all the Freedom you could deſire; Now I have one requeſt to you, that you would allow me the ſame

|| See *Nullity of the Romiſh* Faith, *Chap.* 7. *Sect.* 4.

priviledg

priviledg, with patience to hear, and if you can, answer what I shall object against your Religion.

Pop. *With a very good will, I'le meet you here to morrow at this time; so at present adieu.*

The SECOND CONFERENCE.

Protest. WELL met Sir, I see you are as good as your word, and I hope you will allow me as much freedom and patience as I did you.

Pop. *I shall willingly do it, therefore speak freely, and so will I; and if Truth be on your side, let it prevail.*

Prot. I shall divide my Discourse into two parts.

1. Some general Considerations, which indeed do very much set me against your Religion.

2. I shall examine the Grounds of your Principal Points of Doctrine; for to meddle with all, will be needless; if your Pillars fall, the rest cannot stand. For the first, there are several weighty Considerations against your

Religion; I shall give you them in order. T
first general Consideration is this:

1. That your Church declines all Judgme
but her own, and makes her self Judg in h
own Cause; you do not allow Scripture to
Judg, nor the Ancient Fathers (for all your t
of Antiquity) nor indeed any but your selve
the Pope, or a Council of your own; and yo
Church it seems must determine, whether
be a true Church or no, and whether she be pu
or corrupt, or whether she be Infallible or n
Is this so.

Pop. *I confess this is our Doctrine, and
think grounded upon Reason.*

Prot. You speak against the common sense
all men. In all Controversies or Differences b
tween Men and Men, we generally suspect th
party who will submit to no Judgment but h
own; and he who is willing to refer himself
any third indifferent party, is generally pr
sumed to have the best Cause; and this is o
Case, Protestants do not make themselves an
their own Church the only Judg (tho the
might as justly and reasonably do it as you), bu
they are very willing to submit to other Judge
they refer themselves to be judged by the Scrip
ture, which is acknowledged to be a most in
different Judg; If that do not please you, the
refer themselves to the Fathers for the first fi
hundred years, till your Abominations ha
leavened the World, according to what wa
foretold, *Rev.* 13. 8.

2. My second Consideration is this; You d
not only decline the Scriptures Judgment, bu
you infinitely disparage and vilifie it. I mee
with

with several passages quoted out of your Authors to that purpose.

Pop. *Possibly you may out of some inconsiderable ones, but not out of any of note and name in our Church.*

Prot. Yes, out of your prime Authors. I read that Cardinal *Hosius* in his *Advertisement to King* Sigismund, hath this Expression, *if they* (that is the Hereticks) *say, it is written, that is the voice of the Devil, speaking in his members.* *. But that it is below a Cardinal to read the Bible, he would have found the words also in Christs mouth. I read that *Costerus* calls the Scripture by way of contempt, *Paper and Parchment. God* (saith he) *would not have his Church* (by which always understand the Papists themselves) *now depend upon Paper and Parchment, as* Moses *made the carnal* Israelites. And again, *That which is written in the heart of the Church, doth by many degrees excel the Scriptures; First, because that was written by the Finger of God, but this by the Apostles* ‡, as if the writings of the Apostles were only a device of man. I read that Cardinal *Pool* writing to *Henry* the Eighth, saith thus, *What an absurd thing is this, that thou didst attibrute more Authority to the Scripture than to the Church, since the Scripture hath no Authority but for the decree of the Church* ||? (he means the *Roman* Church). I see we are highly concerned to please your

---

* *De expresso Dei Verbo.* ‡ *Enchiridon cap.* 1. || *De primatu Romanæ Ecclesia, fol.* 91.

Church, else we are like to have no Scriptures. I read that *Pighius* saith, *The Apostles did never intend to subject our Faith to their Writings, but rather their Writings to our Faith* (c) And afterward he saith, *The Scriptures are (as one said not more pleasantly than truly) a Nose of Wax which suffers it self to be drawn hither or thither as a man pleaseth* (d). I read that your *Bullenger* saith, *The Scripture is the Daughter, the Church the Mother, which gives being and sufficiency to her she begets.* (No wonder then, the Church makes bold with the Scripture, to add, or alter or dispense with it. We all know the Mother may correct the Daughter). I confess when I read those passages produced by our Writers, I suspect they wronged them. Are these things true?

Pop. *I acknowledg it; and it is a vain thing for me to deny it, for the Books and those passages in them, are extant under their own hands: And I must confess these Authors are as considerable and approved as any we have. But you ought to put a favourable sense upon them.*

Prot. I would not strain them, nor make them worse than they are. Take them as you will, they are abominable Expressions, and (to me) a great evidence, that the Scripture is no friend to your Church. And I conclude this to be one accomplishment of what Christ hath said, *Every one that doth evil, hateth the Light, neither cometh to the Light, lest his deeds*

(c) *Eccles. Hierarch Lib.* 2. *Cap.* 2. (d) *Lib. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *fol.* 102.

shall be reproved, Joh. 3. 20. And if this be the Spirit by which your Church is guided, I am sure it is not the Spirit of God and of Truth; for that teacheth men reverence and love to the Scriptures: You seem to do like *Herod*, who being convinced that he was not of the Royal Race of the *Jews*, did burn their Genealogies and Records, that his false pretences might not be confuted by them. And just so do you endeavour to do by the Scriptures.

3. My third Consideration against your Religion is this; That your Cause is such as dares not abide Tryal; This is the honour and happiness of our Religion; We are allowed to examine all that our Ministers say; and we have a Rule (which we may perule) to try them by, *viz.* the Holy Scriptures, which you dare not suffer your People to read. And this I take to be a secret Confession of your guilt; and I am told your *Alphonsus de Castro* saith, *That from the reading of the Scriptures all Heresies come* ‡.

Pop. *I think your experience hath justified that Expression. You see what you get by the reading of the Scriptures, even this, that you are crambled into a Thousand Sects.*

Prot. Our Saviour was not of your mind, for he thought not acquaintance with, but ignorance of the Scriptures was the cause of Error; *Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures*, Mat. 22. 29. Nor did he only allow, but command the *Jews*

‡ *Contra Hæreses, l.* 5. *c.* 6.

to

to *search the Scripture*, without any fear of this Inconvenience, *John* 5. 39. Had St. *Paul* been of your mind, he would not have commended but reproved the *Bereans* for searching the Scriptures, and examining his Doctrine by them *Acts* 17. 11. If any of your People should do as the *Beræans* did, they would be sent to the Inquisition. I do not deny, but too many make a bad use of the Scripture, and wrest it to wicked purposes, which is to me no better an Argument than this; Wine makes many men drunk therefore no Wine must be sold. The Doctrine of free Grace was abused by thousands (as we read), therefore St. *Paul* did ill in Preaching of it. The Light of the Sun hurts sore Eyes, therefore *Solomon* was mistaken, when he said, *It is a pleasant thing to behold the Sun.* But since you speak of this, I pray you let me ask you one question; Were not most of the Heresies that ever were in the Church, brought in by learned Men?

Pop. *I cannot deny that, for it is notorious known.*

Prot. Then you shut up the wrong Door; for it seems, it is not the unlearned Mans reading but the learned Mans perverting the Scripture which is the true Cause and Foundation of Heresies: And besides, you must not do evil, that Good may come out of it; nor defraud People of their greatest Treasure, nor keep them from their Duty, for fear of some Inconveniences. This is to make your selves wiser than God.

Pop. *But indeed you slander us in this point We do not absolutely forbid reading of the Scri-*

tures. The Council of Trent *allows it, provided you can get the Biſhops leave.*

Prot. It is true, that Council pretends to give ſome ſuch Liberty; but they take away with one hand, what they give with the other; for in their Index of forbidden Books, they have this paſſage: 'Since experience ſheweth, that 'the promiſcuous reading of the Bible brings 'more evil than good; therefore if any man ſhall 'dare to read, or have a Bible without a Licenſe 'from the Biſhop or Inquiſitor, he ſhall not be 'capable of Abſolution *, unleſs he part with 'his Bible. But in truth, this pretended Licenſe is but an handſome blind: For in that very place there is this Obſervation added to that Rule, 'That the Power of giving ſuch Licenſes of 'reading, or keeping the vulgar Bibles, is taken 'away from ſuch Biſhops and Inquiſitors, by the 'command and uſage of the *Roman* and univer-'ſal Inquiſition. At beſt, it ſeems, I muſt not obey Chriſts command of *ſearching the Scripture*, unleſs the Biſhop give me leave. But I pray you tell me, Do your People uſe to ask, and the Biſhops to give them leave to read the Bible?

Pop. *I will not diſſemble with you, They do not. And the truth is, an approved writer of ours,* Ledeſima *puts the queſtion*, What if a man ſhould come to the Biſhop, and deſire Liberty to read the Bible, and that with a good intention? *to which he replies, that* the Biſhop ſhould anſwer him in the Words of Chriſt, *Matt.* 20.

---

* *In fine Concil. Trident. Reg.* 4.

20. Ye

20. Ye know not what ye ask; and indeed (*saith he, and he saith it truly*) the root of this demand is an heretical Disposition *.

Prot. Then I perceive in this, as well as in other things, you are more careful to deceive People with pretences, than to inform them. But indeed, you tell me no more than I had read or heard out of your own Authors. It was the speech of your Pope *Innocent*, That *the Mountain which the Beast must not touch, is the holy and holy Scriptures which the unlearned must not read* *: and your Doctors commonly affirm that People must not be suffered to read the Scriptures, because *we must not give holy things to Dogs, nor cast pearls before Swine.*

My fourth general Consideration against your Religion is this, That it grosly contradicts the great designs and ends of the Christian Religion, which all confess to be such as these, The glorifying of God, and his Son Jesus Christ, and the humbling and abasing of Men, the beating down of all Sin, and the promoting of serious Holiness. Are not these the chief ends of Religion?

Pop. *I do freely acknowledg they are, and our Religion doth most answer these ends.*

Prot. That you and I will now try. And for the first, Your Religion doth highly dishonour God sundry ways. What can be a greater dishonour to God, than to make the holy Scriptures (that you confess to be the word of God) to depend upon the Testimony and Authority

---

* *De Sacris vernaculis.*

of your Pope, or Church, and to say that the word of God is but a dead Letter, and hath no Authority over us, without their Interpretation and Approbation; By which means Malefactors (for such all Men are, *Rom.* 3. 9, 10. your Pope not excepted) are made Judges of, and Superior to that Law whereby they are condemned? Tell me, Would not the *French* King take it for a great dishonour, if any of his Subjects should say, That his Edicts and Decrees had no Authority over his People without their Approbation?

Pop. *Yes, doubtless he would.*

Prot. Just so you deal with God; and what can be a fouler dishonour to God, than that which your great *Stapleton* affirmed, and *Gretser* and others justified, and your Church to this day have never disowned it, *That the Divinity of Christ and of God,* (in respect of us) *depends upon the Authority of the Pope* *? And what more dishonourable to God than what your great Champion *Bellarmine* saith, That *if the Pope should err in forbidding Virtues* (which God hath commanded) *and commanding Vices* (which God hath forbidden); (And that he may so err, divers of your most famous and approved Authors confess ‡) *the Church were bound to believe Vices to be good, and Virtues bad, unless she would sin against Conscience* ||, that is in plain terms, the Pope is to be obeyed before God. Again, is it not highly Dishonourable to God, to give the Worship which is proper to God,

* *Triplicato contra,* Whitak. c. 17.

‡ See *Nullity.* || *De Pont.* l. 4. c. 5.

unto

unto the Creature? I confeſs the Prophet *Iſaiah* hath convinced me of it, *Iſa.* 42. 8. 'I am the 'Lord, that is my Name, and my Glory will 'not give to another, neither my Praiſe to gra-'ven Images.

Pop. *I alſo am of the ſame mind; but it is a ſcandal of your Miniſters, to ſay we give God Honour to the Creature; I know where about you are, you mean it of Images; whereas we worſhip them with a lower kind of Worſhip.*

Prot. You worſhip them with ſuch a kind of worſhip, as neither Angels nor Saints durſt receive: *Cornelius* did not worſhip *Peter* with Divine Worſhip as God (for he knew he was but Gods Miniſter); yet *Peter* durſt not receive it. It was an inferior Worſhip which the Devil required of Chriſt, for he acknowledged at the ſame time, God to be his Superior and the giver of that Power he claimeth, *Luke* 4. 6. and yet that was the worſhip which Chriſt ſaith God hath forbidden to be given to any Creature. You are a valiant *Man*, that dare venture your immortal Soul upou a nice School-diſtinction. I pray you, do you not Worſhip the Bread in the Sacrament with that Worſhip which you call *Latria*, which is proper to God?

Pop. *We do ſo, and that upon very good reaſon, becauſe it is not Bread but the very Body of Chriſt into which the Bread is turned.*

Prot. But what if the Bread be not converted into Chriſt's Body? Is it not then an high Diſhonour to God, and indeed damnable Idolatry?

Pop.

Pop. *Yes, our* Fisher, *the famous Martyr and Bishop of* Rochester, *saith,* No man can doubt, if there be nothing in the Eucharist but Bread, that the whole Church hath been guilty of Idolatry for a long time, nnd therefore must needs be damned *: *But we are well assured that it is no longer Bread: and yet I must add this; if peradventure it should still remain Bread, yet for as much as we believe it to be the Body of our Lord, our ignorance, I hope, would excuse us from Idolatry, and God would not impute it to us.*

Prot. Tell me, I beseech you, Will all kind of Ignorance excuse a man?

Pop. *No certainly, There is a wilful and affected Ignorance, which, because it is against clear light, will not excuse.*

Prot. Tell me further, Did this excuse the *Jews* from their sin of crucifying Christ, and the Damnation due to it, that *they did it ignorantly?* Acts 3. 17.

Pop. *No, because they shut their eyes against the plain light, and clear evidence of that truth, that Christ was the* Messiah.

Prot. No less do you in the Doctrine of the Sacrament; for they had no greater evidences against them, than Sense and Reason, and Scripture; all which you reject (as I shall prove by God's help). And as your Religion dishonours God, so doth it also highly dishonour Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, who is expressly called the *one Mediator*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. But you have conferred that Honour upon many others, Saints and Angels.

* *Ruffensis contra Oecopadiam, c.* 2. *fol.* 3.

Pop.

Pop. *True there is but one chief Mediator but there may be other secondary Mediators.*

Prot. In like manner, to that which the Apostle there saith, *there is but one God*, it might be said, there are other secondary Gods, and so we might introduce the Heathen Gods into the Church. It is the great Prerogative of Jesus Christ, that he is the Redeemer of the World, yet your *Bellarmin* was not afraid to communicate this honour to the Creature, and expressly saith, It is not absurd, that holy men be called our Redeemers after a sort; and more of the like stuff we shall meet with before we part: yet again, your Religion, as it depresseth God, so it exalts the Creature. I will instance but in one thing, and that is your Doctrine of Justification by the merit of good Works. A Doctrine, which St. *Paul* affirms gives unto a man matter of boasting and glorying, *Rom.* 3 27. 'where is boasting then? It is excluded; By 'what Law? of works? Nay, but by the Law of 'Faith: *and Rom.* 4. 2. For if *Abraham* were 'justified by Works, he hath whereof to Glory. Next you grant, That it is the great design and intent of Religion, to discourage and beat down Sin, which your Religion doth exceedingly incourage by your Doctrines and Practices in Absolutions and Indulgences In my acquaintance, I have known several Papists that have wonderfully encouraged themselves in their wicked ways from this consideration; especially when *Easter* drew near, because they knew

* *De Indulgentis*, cap. 4 *sub finem.*

they

they ſhould very ſuddenly be ſhriven, and abſolved, and be (as they ſaid) as ſound and clean as when they came firſt into the World: I have known alſo divers of our looſe Proteſtants that have turn'd to your Religion, that they might have greater liberty for, and the more ſecurity in Sin; and in my Conſcience, if I would let my Luſts chuſe a Religion for me, they would preſently lead me to your Religion: And ſo again, your Religion doth not at all promote ſerious Holineſs, but the Soul and Spirit of it is dwindled away into meer formality: What can be of more peſtilent Conſequence to true Holineſs, than to tell a Man, that the ſaying ſo many *Pater-Noſters*, or *Ave-Maries* (tho it may be he is talking, or gazing about in the midſt of his Devotions) will procure him acceptance with God? Is it true, that your great and devout Doctor *Suarez* ſaith, That *it is not eſſential to Prayer, that a man ſhould think of what he ſaith?*

Pop. *It is true, he doth ſay ſo in his Book of Prayer.*

Prot. Then I confeſs, your Religion hath the advantage of ours, for a man may do two buſineſſes at once; It hath ſet me much againſt your Religion, ſince I underſtood that you turned that great Doctrine of Repentance into a meer formality: What a ſad Doctrine is it that your great Maſters teach, That Repentance is not neceſſary at all times, but only on Holy-days (as ſome of your Authors ſay); only once in a year, that is, at *Eaſter* (as others)? Nay indeed, once in all his Life, and that in danger of death (as *Navar* and *Cajetan*)?

What

what an Encouragement is this to Wickedne
to tell men that a thousand of their Sins are v
nial, which tho not repented of, will not exclu
them from the favour of God, and from Salva
tion? but I will rake no farther into this Ken
nel?

I think this may serve turn, to let you see that I had warrant to say, That your Religion contradicts the design and end of all Religion.

4. The fifth Consideration that sets me against your Religion, is the desperate Issues that you are driven to in the Defence of your Cause; as for Example, in the great point of Infallibility, I observe your Learned Doctors are beaten out of all their former Assertions and Opinions; you have been driven from Scripture to the Fathers, from them to the Pope, from him to a Council, and thence to the Pope with a Council, and (as a further sign of a desperate Cause) the Jesuits are brought to that Exigence, that they are forced to affirm the Pope to be Infallible in Matters of Fact, which is confessedly a new Upstart and indeed, monstrous Opinion; and yet those piercing Wits see their Cause cannot be defended without it: and others seeing the vanity of all their former pretences, have been forced to resolve all into the present Churches Testimony *. So for the point of Idolatry, you are driven to those Straits, that you cannot excuse your selves from Idolatry, but by such pretences as will excuse both Jewish and Gen-

* *Greg. de Valentia.*

tile Idolaters; and one of your ableſt Champions is brought to this plunge, that he is forced to affirm, that *ſome Idolatry is lawful* *. I might inſtance in very many others, but I forbear.

6. A ſixth Conſideration is taken from the partiality of your Religion: That Religion which is from God, is doubtleſs agreeable to the Nature and Will of God. But ſo is not your Religion, for it is guilty of that reſpect of Perſons which Scripture every where denies to be in God, *Acts* 10. 34. *Rom.* 2. 11. *Job* 34. 19.

Pop. *How is our Religion guilty of reſpect of Perſons?*

Prot. I might ſhew it in many things, but I will confine my ſelf to one particular; and that is, in point of Indulgences. The Souls of all that dye in venial Sins, are doomed to thoſe terrible Pains of Purgatory, there to continue none knows how long (by the way, I cannot but take notice of the great Unhappineſs of thoſe Chriſtians, that lived and died in the days of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, that have been multitudes of them frying in Purgatory to this day, and are like to be ſo as long as the World laſts; whereas thoſe that live nearer the end of the World, muſt needs have a far ſhorter abode there; ſo Men are puniſhed with continuance of their Torments meerly for the circumſtance of time of their Birth; but this is not the thing I am at) from theſe

* *Greg. de Valentia.*

pains

pains of Purgatory there is no way to deliv
a man but by Indulgences; and these Indu
gences must be bought off with Money, a
wealthy Men may buy off those corporal Pa
(which the Rascal-herd must suffer witho
Bail or Main-prise) and turn them into a Fi
of the Purse. So I see it was not without re
son that *Solomon* said, *Money answers all thing*
I have heard that your Tax of the Apostolic
Chancery (put forth by the Authority of yo
Church, where there is a price put upon all h
dulgences, and upon all kind of Sins) hath th
Expression, 'Diligently note, that these Grac
'(*of Indulgences*) are not given to the Poor; b
'cause they are not, and therefore cannot be com
'forted (*a*); by which I see, that if St. *Peter* him
self should arise from the dead, and come to h
Successor, with his old tone, *Silver and Gol*
have I none; if he were a thousand *Peters*, h
must into Purgatory without Mercy. I a
told that another of your Authors, *Augustin*
de Ancona an Author of Great note with yo
tells us, 'that Indulgences are for the relief of th
'Churches (*that is, the Popes and their Prelate*
'Indigencies, which (*b*) is not revealed by

(a) *Diligenter nota quod hujusmodo gratiæ n*
dantur pauperibus, quia non sunt; *ideo non p*
sunt consolari. Taxa Cancellariæ Apostolicæ
Tit. de Matrimoniali.

(b) *Nam Indulgentiæ fiunt ad relevandum in*
digentiam Ecclesiæ, quæ non relevatur per sola
voluntatem dandi, sed per datum. De Potestat
Papæ, quest. 30. art. 3.

'willingne

'willingneſs to give (which is all that any poor 'Man can pretend to) but by the gift it ſelf. (It ſeems your Church is not of Gods mind; for if *there be a willing mind, he accepteth it for the deed*, 2 Cor. 8. 12.) And a little after (as I am told) he ſaith, 'As to the remiſſion of puniſhment 'which is procured by Indulgences, in that caſe it 'is not inconvenient, that the rich is in a better 'condition than the poor, for there it is not ſaid, 'Come and buy without money (c) I confeſs that were a dangerous ſpeech, and would utterly undo all the Church of *Rome*. It is ſufficient that *Iſaiah* once ſaid it, and Chriſt again, *Come and drink freely*. People ſhould have been wiſe, and taken them at the word, for they are never like to hear it a third time. Is this true?

Pop. *They do indeed ſay ſo; and the practice of our Church manifeſts to all the World, that Indulgences are ſold for Money; and the condition of the rich, in that, is better than the poor. But what great matter is that, as to the pardon of Sin, and eternal Life or Death, both Rich and Poor are a like? This difference is only as to the pains of Purgatory.*

Prot. Is that nothing to you? you ſpeak againſt your own, and all mens ſenſe; we ſee how highly men eſteem to be freed from a painful, tho ſhort Diſeaſe here; how much more to

(c) *Quantum ad remiſſionem pœnæ quæ acquiritur per indulgentiam, in tali cauſa non eſt inconveniens, quod dives ſit melioris conditionis quam pauper. Ibi enim non dicitur, Venite & emite ſine pecunia.* Ibid.

be

be more free from such Pains as you all con
to be unspeakably more sharp and grievous, th
all the Pains that ever were endured in t
World: It is so considerable a thing, that I
sure you, it is to me matter of wonder (if Chr
and the Apostles had been of your mind) ho
it came to pass so unluckily, that the Poor o
ly should receive the Gospel; whereas, if t
Men of that Age had not been all Fools, t
Rich would have been most forward to ent
tain it.

7. But to proceed. My seventh Consideratio
against your Religion, is taken from its gr
hazard, and utter uncertainty. According
the Doctrine of your Church, no man can
sure of his Salvation without a Revelation; b
he must go out of the World, not knowi
whither he goes. Indeed there is nothing b
hazard and uncertainty in your Religion. If
pose you grant that all your Faith, and cons
quently your Salvation, depends upon the infa
lible Authority of your Church.

Pop. *That is most certain.*

Prot. Are you then infallibly Certain, th
your Church is infallible? Or do you only pr
bably believe it?

Pop. *I am but a private Priest, and therefo
cannot pretend to Infallibility; but I am fully s
tisfied in it, that the Church is infallible in it s*

Prot. Then I see you pretend to no m
certainty than I have; for I know (and yo
grant) that the Scripture is infallible in it s
and I know its Infallibility as certainly as yo
know the Infallibility of your Church. But
may you tell me, what is your opinion? I kno

know you are divided; but where do you place the Infallibility, or where do you lay the Foundation of your Faith?

Pop. *To deal freely with you, I place it in the Pope; who when he determines things* out of his Chair, *is infallible: for St.* Peter *who was Supream Head of the Church, left the Pope his Succeſſor.*

Prot. Then it ſeems your Faith doth wholly depend on theſe things, that St. *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*, and died there; and that he left the Pope his Succeſſor in his ſupream and infallible Authority.

Pop. *It doth ſo.*

Prot. How then are you infallibly aſſured of the truth of theſe things, which are all matters of Fact?

Pop. *Becauſe they are affirmed by ſo many of the ancient Fathers and Writers.*

Prot. Were thoſe Fathers or Writters infallible Perſons?

Pop. *No.*

Prot. Then might they, and ſo may you be miſtaken in that point; and ſo indeed you have nothing but a meer conjecture for the Foundation of your Faith. But again, are you infallibly ſure, that Saint *Peter*'s Intention was to leave his Infallibility to the Pope? For I do not read that St. *Peter* left it in his laſt Will. I tell you true, it is ſtrange to me, that St. *Peter* ſhould write two Catholick Epiſtles, and (as I obſerved before) not leave one word concerning this matter. For my part I ſhall always rather Queſtion the Popes Authority, than St. *Peter*'s Fidelity or Diſcretion, in omit-

ting so fundamental Point, when he put in m
ny of far less concernment. But further I d
mand, How are you assured that St. *Peter* i
tended to leave his power, and did effectua
leave it to his Successors?

Pop. *By the unanimous consent of the Ancie*
Fathers.

Prot. I wonder at your Confidence, that yo
dare affirm a thing which our Authors * have
clearly proved to be false. But suppose it we
so, that the Fathers had said it; tell me, are th
Fathers infallible? At least are they so in the
reports of matter of Fact?

Pop. *No: we confess that it is only the Pope a*
Council that are infallible, not the Fathers; an
to be true to you, even the Pope himself is not in
fallible in his reports of matters of Fact.

Prot. Then you have nothing but a meer con
jecture, or historical Report delivered by men
liable to mistake, for the great Foundation of
your Faith. Yet once more, have you any
greater or better certainty for your Faith than
the Pope himself?

Pop. *God forbid I should be so impudent a*
wicked to say so; for my Faith depends upon his
certainty.

Prot. Very well. How I beseech you is the
Pope assured? What is it that makes him infal-
libly certain of his own Infallibility? Is he as-
sured of it by Revelation?

Pop. *No, (as I have told you oft) we pretend*
to no such thing.

Prot. How then?

---

* *Moulin, Reinolds* against *Hart*, and others.

Pop.

Pop. *By the Spirit of God which guides him into all truth.*

Prot. How is he assured that the Spirit of God guides him?

Pop. *By the promises God hath made to him; I need not repeat them, they are known already,* Thou art *Peter*, &c. *Simon, Simon*, I have prayed that thy Faith fail not, *&c.*

Prot. I have already shewn how absurdly these Texts are alledged. But I beseech you, how is the Pope infallibly assured, that this is the true meaning of those Texts? You confess it is not by Inspiration.

Pop. *He knows that, by considering and comparing Scripture with Scripture, and by consulting the Fathers, and by Prayer, Diligence and Obedience,* &c.

Prot. All these things are very good, but any other man may use these means as well as the Pope, and hath as full Promises from God, as any the Pope pretends to, as *Joh.* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will, he shall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God*; and the Spirit of Truth is promised to all that ask it; *Luk.* 11. 13. So if this be all you have to say, God deliver my Soul from such a desperate Religion, wherein all the certainty of its Faith depends upon his Infallibility that is not certain of his own Infallibility.

But I need say no more of this; It is to me an undeniable Argument, that there is no certainty at all in this Foundation; because (as you confess) so many hundreds of your ablest Scholars do utterly reject it. But once more, in my Opinion you run a dreadful hazard in the point

of worshipping of Creatures, Images, Saints and especially the Bread in the Sacrament, which you run other hazards besides those I spoke of. I am told, that your Doctrine is this, That it is necessary to the making of a Sacrament (and so to the Conversion of the Bread into Christ's Body) that the Priest intend to Consecrate it. Is it so?

Pop. *Yes, doubtless,* Bellarmin *and all our Authors largely dispute for that.*

Prot. And can I be sure of another man's intention? It is sufficiently known, that divers of your Priests are prophane, and atheistical Wretches; others envious and malicious; and some actually *Jews.* What assurance have I that my Priest is not such an one, and that he doth not either out of a contempt or hatred of Religion, or Malice against my Person, intend to deceive me, and not make a Sacrament of it? Sure I am they intend to deceive their People in the preaching of the Word, and why they may not do so in the Administration of the Sacrament, I know not.

8. My eight and last general Consideration is this, That your Religion destroys even the Principles of morality; which true Religion is so far from destroying, that it improves and perfects it. I confess, the bloodiness of your Religion hath ever made me both suspect and loath it. I find that Christ is a Prince of Peace: tho he whipt some out of the Temple, yet he never whipt any into his Church; that he drew in his Disciples with the Cords of a Man, of Conviction and Persuasion; and so did his Apostles after him; but your Religion (like *Draco's*

Law

Laws) is written in Blood. I perceive you answer our Arguments with Fire and Faggot; besides this, your Religion destroys all civil Faith and Society; your Principle is known, and so is your Practice of Equivocation, and keeping no Faith with Hereticks.

Pop. *I know where you are, you mean because of* John Huss, *who after he had the Faith of the Emperor given him for his safe Conduct, was contrary to that Faith put to Death in the Council of* Constance.

Prot. I do so, and what can you say for it?

Pop. *Thus I say, you must not charge upon our Church, the opinion of some few private Doctors, since others disown this, and have written against it.*

Prot. It seems it is a disputable point amongst you, whether you ought to be Honest or not; but I have heard that *John Huss* was condemned by the Council of *Constance*, and that when the Emperor scrupled to break his Faith, they declared he might do it, and ought to do it, Is it so?

Pop. *It is true, what was done in that point was done by the Council.*

Prot. And you hold Councils (especially where the Pope joyns with them, as he did with that Council) to be Infallible; and therefore this I may confidently charge upon you as a Principle of your Religion; I cannot but observe your fine Devices: At other times when we alledg Passages out of any of your learned Doctors which make against you, you tell us they are but private Doctors, and we must

judg of you by your Councils. Now here bring an approved Councils Testimony, and send us back to your private Doctors.

Pop. *These discourses of yours are only gene I had rather you would come to the other th you proposed,* viz. *to examine the particular poi of our Religion, wherein I hope I shall give such solid Grounds and Reasons, that when shall understand them, you will embrace them.*

Prot. You shall find me ingenuous and docil only remember, I expect not Words, but so Arguments. I think our best course will be pick out some principal Points of your Relig on, and examine them; for the rest will eith stand or fall as they do.

Pop. *I am perfectly of your mind, let us pr ceed accordingly.*

Prot. First then, if you please, we will beg with the Sacrifice of the Mass, which you say essential to the Christian Religion.

Pop. *It is so, and* Bellarmin *rightly saith, th* where there is no Sacrifice *(as you Protestan have none)* there is in truth no Religion.

Prot. Therefore, I pray you, let me hear on or two (for those are as good as a hundred) o your chief Grounds and Reasons for the Sacri fice.

Pop. *I approve your motion, and I shall only insist upon two Arguments; First, the Sacrifice of the Mass was appointed by God or Christ, in the words of Institution of the Sacrament,* Do this in remembrance of me. *It is the great Argument of the Council of* Trent ‡.

‡ *Sess.* 22. *cap.* 9. *Can.* 2, 3.

Prot.

Prot. I adore the fruitfulness of your Churches invention. It seems they think these two words, *Do this*, contain no less than two of your Sacraments, to wit, that of *Orders*, which makes Priests, and that of the *Supper*.

Pop. *They do so.*

Prot. That, no sober man will easily believe; nor that Christs meaning in the words mentioned was this, *Sacrifice me in remembrance of me.* But let me hear how you prove the Institution of the Mass from these words.

Pop. *Christ bid his Disciples,* do this, *viz that which he did: Christ did in that last Supper truly and properly offer up himself to his Father, his Body under the shape of Bread, his Blood under the shape of Wine; and therefore they were truly and properly to offer up or Sacrifice Christ in the Sacrament. The Argument is* Bellarmin's *.

Prot. How do you prove that Christ did in that last Supper truly and properly offer up his Body and Blood to his Father? I read that Christ offered himself but once, *Heb.* 8. 27. and 9. 25, 26, 27, 28. and 10. 14. and that was upon the Cross; nor do I find that he offered any thing at all to God in that Supper, but only to his Apostles. And what, did Christ Sacrifice himself, and imbrue his hands in his own Blood? And did he eat up his own Body? Did he take his whole Body into his Mouth? These are Monsters of Opinions: But how prove you that Christ did then offer up himself to God?

Pop. *Because Christ speaks in the present tense,* This is my Body which is broken, Blood which

* *De Missa, l.* 6. *c.* 12. *Sextum.*

is ſhed; *he doth not ſay which* ſhall be *broken and ſhed; and therefore it muſt be broken and ſhed at that very time.*

Prot. What a vain Argument is this? You know nothing is more uſual in Scripture than to put the preſent Tenſe for the Future. Chriſt ſaith, 'I do lay down my life, when he means, I will do it ſhortly, *Joh.* 10. 15. 'I do go to my Father, *Joh.* 16. 28. that is, I ſhall go ſhortly. *Do that thou doſt*, that is, are about to do, *Joh.* 13. 27. And in *Matt.* 26. Chriſt ſaith of his Blood 'This is my Blood which is ſhed for many for 'the remiſſion of ſins; and yet I ſuppoſe it was not ſhed at that time, for you all profeſs the Sacrifice of the Maſs is an unbloody Sacrifice; But again, tell me, I pray you, when Chriſt ſaid, *do this*, did they not obey Chriſt's command at that Supper?

Pop. *I cannot deny that.*

Prot. Thence unavoidably follows, that this *doing* concerns the Communicants, as well as (if not more than) the Miniſters; and ſo it is not meant of Sacrificing Chriſt, but receiving of him; and really, if this Text do not, there is no other which doth enjoyn Communicants to receive; which he that can believe, hath got a good maſtery over his Faith. Beſides, what Chriſt here commands his Apoſtles, I find St. *Paul* commands the *Corinthians*, and expounds *doing this*, by *eating and drinking*, 1 Cor. 11. And moreover, if the words *do this*, were the words which did ordain both *Prieſt* and *Sacrifice*, who can think that two of the Evangeliſts, *viz* both *Matthew* and *Mark* would have omitted them in mentioning the words of Inſtitution,

tution, and therefore this may pass. I shall only add, that if our Divines should prove their Doctrines no better than by such wrested Scriptures and Arguments as this, we should hiss them out of the Pulpit; but I suppose you have some better Argument, therefore let me hear it.

Pop. *Consider then that irresistable Argument,* Christ is a Priest after the order of *Melchisedeck. Now* Melchisedeck *did offer up a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine to God,* Gen. 14. *and theeefore Christ was bound in Agrement with this Type, to offer up such a Sacrifice, even his Body and Blood under the Species of Bread and Wine.*

Prot. You tell me, *Melchisedeck* offered up Bread and Wine to God; I find no such matter; it is only a Dream of your own. The History is, *Gen.* 14. where indeed I read of his offering Bread and Wine to *Abraham* and his Soldiers, to refresh them(according to the custom of those times and places,) *Deut.* 23. 3, 4. and *Judg.* 8. 6. but not a word of any offering to God. It is the strangest Relation of a Sacrifice that ever was; here's not one word of the *Altar*, or *Oeffring*, or *Consecration*, or the *Destruction* of the Sacrifice. You grant the thing sacrificed must be destroyed when it is sacrificed; I pray you how is this Bread destroy'd(save only by the Soldiers mouths which you say came after the Sacrifice)?

Pop. *The Bread possibly was destroyed by putting it in the furnace, and the Wine sprinkled upon the Furnace, as* Vasquez *answers* *.

* *In part.* 3. *Thomæ tom.* 3. *q.* 83. *dis.* 220. *ar.* 1. *c.* 3.

Prot. I see it was otherwise in those days than now it is. If I thought my Bread would be destroyed by putting it into the Oven, I assure you I would never put it in.

Pop. *It must be a Sacrifice that is there related; for it follows,* And he was the Priest of the most High God.

Prot. Not at all; for his being Priest evidently relates to that which follows, *and he blessed him and received Tithes of all.* Besides, if *Melchisedeck* did here offer a Sacrifice, was Jesus Christ obliged to offer the same kind of Sacrifice that he did? For Christ was to offer up himself, *Heb.* 9. 10. (which none of his Types did) Tell me first, was *Melchisedeck* a Type of Christ in that action of eating Bread and Wine?

Pop. *Yes doubless, and this was the principal thing; in respect of which, Christ is called a Priest after the order of* Melchisedeck, *or else I say nothing.*

Prot. Then tell me, how can any man in his wits, believe that St. *Paul,* who spends so much of his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, in comparing *Christ* and *Melchisedeck*, and their Priesthood together; and who picks up the very smallest circumstances, as that he was *without Father* &c. should not speak one word of this, (which if you say true) was the principal thing? Besides all this, If *Melchisedeck* was a Type of Christ in that action, did Christ offer Bread and Wine as *Melchisedeck* did?

Pop. *No, but he offered his own Body and Blood under the appearance of Bread and Wine.*

Prot. Nay, now I see there is no possibility of pleasing you; for I expected this all along,

that Chriſt muſt needs have offered the ſame kind of Sacrifice that *Melchiſedeck* did here; But now you forſake your own Argument; and becauſe *Melchiſedeck* did offer Bread and Wine, Chriſt muſt not offer Bread and Wine, but ſomething elſe under thoſe appearances. Now I have heard your two principal Arguments, I hope you will hear mine alſo.

Pop. *Good reaſon I ſhould do ſo.*

Prot. Then firſt, I argue thus; the Sacrifice of Chriſt was perfect, and did perfect all Believers, *Heb.* 10. 14. And therefore it need not and ought not to be repeated, for the Apoſtle proves the Imperfection of Levitical Sacrifices, becauſe they were repeated; *Heb.* 10. 1, 2. *Where remiſſion of Sin is, there is no more offering for Sin, Heb.* 10. 18. Either then Remiſſion was not obtained by his once offering, or there muſt be no more offering; either Chriſts offering upon the Croſs was ſufficient, or yours in the Maſs is unneceſſary.

Pop. *It is not properly repeated; for it is the ſame Sacrifice for ſubſtance which was offered upon the Croſs, and is offered in the Maſs* *.

Prot. How is it of the ſame kind, when you ſay, the one is bloody, the other unbloody; the one offered by Chriſt, the other by a Prieſt? but if it were of the ſame kind, ſo were the Levitical Sacrifices, and all had Relation to Chriſt (as you pretend all Maſſes have), and yet the Apoſtle makes their Repetition an evidence of their Imperfection, *Heb.* 9. 10. And moreover, the Apoſtle denies not only the Repetition of

* *Cornelius a Lapide in* Heb. 7. 21.

other

other Sacrifices, but also of the same Sacrifice, and tells us as plainly (as man can speak) that Christ was to offer up himself but once, *Heb.* 9. 25, *&c.* whereas you will needs over-rule the Apostle, and force Christ to offer up himself thousands of times.

Pop. *It is true, there is but one Sacrifice of Redemption, and Expiation for Sin, and that was the Sacrifice of the Cross; but there are other Sacrifices of Application, to apply that to us.*

Prot. I hope the Word and Sacraments, and Spirit of Christ, are sufficient to apply Christ's Sacrifice. Must we have one Sacrifice to apply another? Whoever heard of one Plaister made to apply another? Or a Ransom paid the second time to apply the former Payment? And you seem to me quite to forget your selves, to destroy the nature of your Sacrifice; for the business of a Sacrifice is Oblation to God, not Application to Men. Besides, I have one Argument more which fully satisfies me; if the Mass be a real and proper Sacrifice, then the thing sacrificed may be really and properly destroyed.

Pop. *That I readily grant, as* Bellarmin * *also doth, and indeed so it was in all the Sacrifices that ever were offered to God.*

Prot. But surely Jesus Christ is not destroyed in the Mass; is he? And are your Priests the murderers of Christ?

Pop. *He is not so destroyed; for we tell you, it is an unbloody Sacrifice: yet he is in a man-*

* *Sacrificium verum & reali veram & realem, occasionem exigit.* Bel de Missa, l. 2. c. 27. *Denique vel in Missa.*

ner deſtroy'd by the Prieſts eating of him; for thereby Chriſt ceaſeth to be where he was before; that is in the Species of Bread and Wine, and the Bread and Wine are deſtroyed.

Prot. Call you this a Deſtruction for one to remove from one place to another, or to ceaſe to be where he was before? This is ridiculous; and yet this ‖ fantaſtical and mock-deſtruction is all which you can bring inſtead of that real Deſtruction which you confeſs neceſſary to the very eſſence of the Sacrifice. And as for the Bread and Wine, they were deſtroyed by Tranſubſtantiation, not by the Oblation or Sacrifice which comes after it.

And now having mentioned that, let us Diſcourſe concerning your Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. And firſt, tell me what is the Doctrine of your Church?

Pop. *That the Council of* Trent *will inform you; which declareth,* That by Conſecration the whole Subſtance of the Bread and Wine is converted into the Subſtance of the Body and Blood of Chriſt ‡.

Prot. How is it poſſible for the Bread to be converted into Chriſts Body, which was made already before the Bread? That Chriſt could turn Water into Wine was poſſible, but that he ſhould turn that Water into ſuch Wine as was in being before that change, this is impoſſible; but let that go. My next queſtion is, if a Chriſtian did actually receive Chriſts Body and Blood, tell me what profit hath he by it?

‖ *Ibid.* ‡ *Seſſ.* 13. *de Euchariſt. cap.* 14.

I cannot

I cannot believe that God would work so many Miracles (as you affirm he doth in this Sacrament) to no purpose. Scripture and Reason tells me, and your Council of *Trent* confesseth *, that the Sacrament is a feast for my Soul, and not for my Body. Is it not so? Now what is my Soul the better for eating the very Body of Christ? When the Woman cried out to our Saviour, ‡ 'Blessed is the Womb that bare thee; *Christ replies*, 'Yea rather, blessed are they that hear Gods 'Word and do it: Nevertheless, if you can solidly prove it, I will receive it; therefore bring forth your principal Arguments for it.

Pop. *I will do so: and our Church proves this point, especially from two places of Scripture,* Joh. 6. *and the words of Institution. I begin with the sixth Chapter of* John, *where our Saviour oft tells us, that the* Bread which he gives is his Flesh, *&c.*

Prot. I have heard that divers of your learned Doctors confess this Chapter speaks not of the Sacrament. Is it so?

Pop. *I will not dissemble with you, that was the opinion of* Biel ||, *Cardinal* Causanus †, Cajetan *, *and* Tapperus ‡, *and divers others.*

Prot. Certainly this Argument is not likely to convince a Protestant, which could not satisfie your own ablest Scholars. But I will not press that farther. Tell me then, do you judg that Christ speaks here of a bodily eating and drinking of his very Flesh and Blood?

---

* *Sess.* 13. *cap.* 2. ‡ *Luk.* 11. 27, 28. || *In Canoni Missa.* † *Ep.* 7. *ad Bohemos.* * *In Aquin. par.* 3. *qu.* 80. *art.* 8. ‡ *Artic. Lovan.* 15.

Pop.

Pop. *We do so.*

Prot. I confess some of the Ancients were of your mind, I mean the *Jews*: But with submission, I am rather of Christs Opinion, who plainly destroys that gross and carnal Sense, telling them, it is the *Spirit that quickneth, the flesh profits nothing*, ver. 63. Again, doth not Christ press this as a necessary and present Duty, upon all the *Jews* that then heard him?

Pop. *That must be granted.*

Prot. Then certainly Christ speaks not of the Sacrament which was not then instituted, and therefore they could not partake of it. I demand further, Is this Sacrament of such Efficacy, that all that receive it are saved? And of such necessity, that all that do not take it, are damned.

Pop. *No, our Church utterly condemns both those Opinions.*

Prot. But this eating of Christs Flesh is such, that Christ saith, all that eat it, are saved, *v.* 24. and all that do not eat it, are damned, *v.* 53. Therefore surely he speaks not of a Sacramental eating: Besides, the whole Laity are utterly undone, if your Sense of this Chapter be true; for I find that drinking of Christs Blood is no less necessary to Life Eternal, than eating of his Flesh; and therefore wo to them to whom you do not allow to drink of the Cup in the Sacrament. I am told this Objection is so considerable, that it forced divers of your Doctors (sore against their will) to forsake this Argument; and therefore this will not do your Work; but I presume you have better Arguments.

Pop.

Pop. *We have so I should urge but one, which is of its self sufficient, from the plain words of Institution,* This is my Body. *Methinks the very hearing of them read should convince you if you would take the words in their plain and proper sense, and not devise I know not what Figures and Tropes.*

Prot. If it were true, that Christ did turn the Bread into his Body by saying these words, *This is my Body*, yet how doth it follow, that the Priest by receiting these words, worketh the same effect; any more than a Priest, every time he reads those words, *Let there be Light*, doth make Light, because God did make it by those words? Or than he raiseth a dead Man, every time he reads those words of Christ, *Lazarus come forth?* Moreover, I have heard, that divers of your most Learned Doctors confess, That this place doth not, nor indeed any other place of Scripture, prove Transubstantiation. I have heard three Cardinals named, *viz. Cajetan* *, and our Bishop of *Rochester* ‡, and *Gameracensis* || and divers famous School-men, as *Scotus* and *Biel*, of whom this is known; and *Durandus* *, and *Ocham* ‡, nnd *Melchior Canus* || and *Vasquez* *, and the great Cardinal *Perron* professeth, that *he believes Transubstantiation, not by virtue of any necessary consequence or Reason, alledged by their Doctors; but by the words of Christ, as they are expounded by Tra-*

* *In* 3. *Thomæ qu.* 75. *art.* 1. ‡ *Contra Captiv. Bab. c.* 10. || *In* 4. *Sentent. qu.* 6. *lit. f.* * *In* 4. *Distinc.* 11. *qu.* 4. *Art.* 14. ‡ *In* 4. *qu.* 6. || *Loc. com. l.* 3. *c.* 3. * *Tom.* 3. *in* 3. *dis.* 180. *c.* 5.

dition ‡; and *Bellarmin* himself confesseth, This opinion is not improbable ||. Methinks so many learned mens forsaking this Argument (who doubtless would have been right glad if it had been solid, and imployed all their wits to search out the strength of it) is to me a convincing evidence of its weakness and vanity, as also the badness of your Cause, that can find no better Argument; yet I am willing to hear what you can say.

Pop. *This then I say, that these words,* This is my Body, *are to be taken in their proper, and not in a figurative Sense; for surely Christ would speak plainly to the understanding of his Disciples, especially when he was so near his Death, and making his last Will and Testament, and instituting the Sacrament; in such cases men use to speak plainly.*

Prot. I readily grant that Christ did speak plainly and intelligibly. But tell me, is not that plain enough, when we take the words as they are commonly used in Scripture?

Pop. *I must needs grant that; but this is not the present case.*

Prot. But it is; for we can give you scores of Instances, as you very well know, where the word *is*, is so taken; nor is any thing more frequent in Scripture, The seven kine, and so the seven ears of Corn, are seven years, *Gen.* 4. 12. 18. the Stars are the Angels of the Churches, *Rev.* 1. 20. the seven heads are seven Mountains, *Rev.* 19. 9. So Christ saith, I am the way, the door, *&c.* So *Zech.* 5. 7, 8. This Woman *is* wickedness; and

‡ *Trairte p.* 793. || *De Euchar. l.* 3. *c.* 23.

thousands

thousands of such Expressions. How do you understand these places?

Pop. *The sense is plain, they* signifie *those things; the Stars* signifie *the Angels, and so for the rest.*

Prot. Then certainly we have the advantage of you in this point, for we take *is* for *signifies* (as you confess it is commonly taken); nor have the *Jews* (as I have been assured by learned Men) any proper word for *signifie* (as the *Greeks* and *Latins* have) but generally express it in this manner: But you must take it (if the Particle thus denote the Bread, as I shall plainly prove it doth) for *is converted into*; a Sense which you cannot give one Example of in all Scripture. I see it was not without reason that you took the Interpretation of Scripture into the Churches hands, for if you had left it in Gods hands, and left one Scripture to do that friendly Office to expound another, you had certainly lost an Article of your Faith; And whereas you say that Christ would speak so as the Disciples might understand him, that sufficiently shews, that yours is not the true sense; for they could never have understood it, and would doubtless have been as much puzled *then*, as all the World *now* is to have apprehended that the Body of Christ was contained under the species of Bread and Wine, invisible and undiscoverable, after the manner of a Spirit; to conceive of a Body without Bigness, Long without Length, Broad without Breadth; Broken whilst it remains Whole (all which you profess to believe). This is to turn Christs plain Speech into a bundle of Riddles; and to call this the plain Sense of the Words

which

which is (as you ſee) a heap of Figures, is a greater Figure than all the reſt; but they did well enough underſtand the words in our ſenſe, becauſe they were well read in Scripture, wherein, as you grant the ſenſe of the word is uſual.

Pop. *If we grant it is uſed ſo in other caſes, yet not in Sacramental Texts, for there Chriſt would ſpeak properly.*

Prot. Yes, It is uſual even in the Sacraments; Is not Circumciſion called the Covenant? *This is my Covenant*; Gen. 17. 10. tho properly it was not the Covenant, but the Seal of it, *Rom.* 4. 11. Is not the Lamb called the Lords Paſſover? *Exod.* 12. tho all men knew it was not the Lamb nor the Ceremony of eating it, which was or could be properly the Lords paſſing over the Houſes of the *Iſraelites*; thus 1 *Cor.* 10. The Rock (that followed the *Iſraelites*) is Chriſt, tho it was ſo only Figuratively and Sacramentally. Moreover, I am told, that divers of your own Brethren acknowledg Figures here. *Taperus* ſaith, It is not convenient to admit of Tropes here, provided they be ſuch as do not exclude the true Preſence of Chriſts Body *: and that the Biſhop of *Eureux* owns three Figures in the words of this Sacrament ‡; and that *Suarez* ||, *Bellarmin* ∴, and divers others confeſs as much.

Pop. *It is true, they do ſay ſo.*

Prot. Beſides, you cannot think ſtrange, if

* *Artic. Lovan.* 3. ‡ *Repet. c.* 3. || *In Tom.* 3. *diſ.* 60. *ſect.* 2. ∴ *De Euchariſtia, l.* 1. *c.* 11.

there

there be Figures in the first part, *This is my Body*, since it is most apparent there are Figures in the last part, 'This is the new Testament in 'my Blood. Here are not one, but divers Figures in it. The *Cup* you grant is taken for the Liquor in it, there is one Figure: the Wine in the Cup is taken for the Blood, which was not in the Cup: that is a strange Figure indeed (Logicians call it *Non-sence.*) This Cup, or Wine, or Blood (if you please) is the new Testament or Covenant: whereas it was only the Seal of the new Testament, as is most manifest because it is called, *The Blood of the new Testament, and the new Testament in my Blood.* Besides other strange Figures, which I shall have occasion to speak to by and by, Here is Figure upon Figure, and yet you have the impudence to reproach us for putting in but one Figure, which you confess to be very frequent. Wonder, O Heavens, and judg O Earth, whether these men do not strain at Gnats, and swallow Camels! And nothing doth more confirm the truth in this point, than to consider into what absurdities this Doctrine hath forced you, even to say, that *the Blood of Christ is properly the Covenant or Testament* *. And that there are *two sorts of Christs blood, the one in the Cup, the other shed on the Cross* †, *And that the Blood of Christ is shed in the Sacrament*, and yet never stirreth out of the Veins: Did ever God or Man speak of such Blood-shed? Therefore for shame never

* *Bel. de Euch. l.* 1. *c.* 11. † *De Euch.* 1. c. 11. *Ad quartem dico.*

charg

charge us with underſtanding this Text figuratively. But again, let me ask you, Will you affirm that theſe words, *This is my Body*, are to be taken properly? Doth your Church underſtand them ſo?

Pop. *Yes ſurely, or elſe we do ill to reproach you for taking them improperly.*

Prot. The words are not true in a proper Senſe, nor indeed do you underſtand them ſo.

Pop. *Make that good, and I muſt give up this cauſe for ever.*

Prot. Firſt, for the word *This*, it is moſt evident that it is meant of Bread: It is impoſſible for words to expreſs any thing more plainly, than that by *This*, is meant the Bread. It is ſaid expreſly, that *Chriſt took Bread and brake it, and gave it, and ſaid, Take, Eat,* THIS *is my Body.* Where *This* neceſſarily relates to that which Chriſt took, and brake, and gave. After Chriſt came the Apoſtles, and particularly St. *Paul*, and he expounds the mind of Chriſt (and I hope you do not think he was ſo bad an expoſitor, that his Comment was harder than the Text, and he tells us thrice in a breath that it is Bread, 1 Cor. 11. 26. *As oft as you eat this Bread*, and *whoſoever ſhall eat this Bread*, and *ſo let him eat of that Bread.* And again, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The Bread which we break is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt?* And the participation of the Sacrament is called, *breaking of Bread*, Act. 2. 46. and 20. 7. which your Authors underſtand of the Sacrament: and beſides *This*, whatever it is, is broken, as it follows, but you dare not ſay, Chriſts Body is broken. Now

then,

then, since it is most evident, that this is meant of the Bread, I hope you will not say, this is properly Christs Body.

Pop. *No, We are not so absurd to say, this Bread is Christs Body, for that is false, and against common sense, as* Bellarmin *well saith* *.

Prot. What then do you mean by the word *This?*

Pop. *By* This, *I understand neither the Bread nor Christs Body, but in general, this Substance which is contained under this Species* ||.

Prot. What do you mean by that? I pray you tell me, Do you believe that there are any more substances under these species, besides the Bread first, and afterwards the Body of Christ? Do not you profess, that as soon as ever it ceaseth to be Bread, it becomes the Body of Christ?

Pop. *We do so.*

Prot. Then surely if it be a substance, according to you, it must be either Bread, or the *Body* of Christ; but you allow it to be neither, and therefore it is no substance at all. In the next place, for the word *is*, I have shewed, you do not understand that properly neither; but for the word *Body* also, do you understand that properly?

Pop. *Yes without doubt.*

Prot. I am told that your Church professeth to believe that Christs Body is there after the manner of a Spirit, taking up no Room; that

---

* *De Eucharist. l.* 3. *c.* 19. || *Bellar. de Eucharist. l.* 3. *c.* 12.

Heads

Heads, Hands, Feet, are altogether in the least Crumb of the Host. Is this true?

Pop. *Yes, we all agree in that.*

Prot. Then sure I am, the word *Body* is most improperly taken: A learned man well observes, that *you plead for the propriety of words, and destroy the propriety of things* *. How can you say that it is properly a Body; which wants the essential property of a Body, which is, to have quantity, and take up room? Take away this, and the Body may be properly a Spirit; for it is that only which differenceth it from a Spirit; So now I see you neither do, nor can understand these words properly; and upon the whole matter, that this Doctrine is false, and your Proofs most weak and frivolous. You shall see that I have better Arguments against your Doctrine than you have for it.

Pop. *I pray you let me hear them, but be brief in them.*

Prot. I have only three Arguments; your Doctrine is against Sense, against Reason, and against Scripture.

Pop. *Let me see how you will make these things good.*

Prot. For the first I ask you, if I am as sure that your Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false, as you are sure that the Christian Religion is true; will you desire more evidence?

Pop. *If I should, I were an unreasonable Person.*

Prot. And have you any greater assurance now of the truth of the Christian Religion, than

* *J. Place de la missa.*

you

you could have had, if you had lived in Christ's days?

Pop. *That were impudence to affirm: but what do you mean?*

Prot. If you had lived *then*, what greater evidence could you have had of it, than what your Sense afforded: for since the great Argument for Christianity (as all agree) was the words that Christ spake, and the works Christ did: how could you be sure that he did so speak, or so work, if you may not credit the reports of your Eyes and Ears? This was St. *Lukes* great evidence of the Truth of what he writes, that *it was delivered to him by eye-witnesses*, St. *Luke* 1. 1, 2. and St. *John's*, *What we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled of the word of Life*; 1 Joh. 1. And St. Paul for Christs Resurrection, that *he was seen of Cephas, then of the* 12, *then of the* 500, 1 Cor. 15. 5, 6. Even *Thomas* his Infidelity yielded to this Argument, that if *he did thrust his hand into Christs side, he would believe*, Joh. 20. 25. Christ judged this a convincing Argument, when the Apostles thought he had been a Spirit, *Handle me and see, for a Spirit hath no Flesh and Bones*, as you see me have, *Luke* 24. 39. Are these things true?

Pop. *I cannot deny it, they are not yours, but Scripture-Assertions.*

Prot. And do not all my Senses tell me that this is Bread?

Pop. *I must grant that; but your Sense is deceived.*

Prot. Then your Senses also might have been deceived about the words and works of Christ, and

and so the greatest Evidence of Christian Religion is lost; but for my part, it makes me abhor your Religion; that so you may but seem to defend your own Opinions, you care not if you shake the Pillars of Christianity. My second Argument is, That your Doctrine of Transubstantiation is against Reason. Tell me, I pray you, do you think any of the Articles of Christian Religion are contrary to Reason?

Pop. *No, they may be above Reason, but God forbid I should be so injurious to Christianity, to say any of them are against Reason.*

Prot. But your Doctrine is as much against Reason as Sense, for it makes you believe things absolutely impossible, and gross Contradictions.

Pop. *You may imagine many things impossible that really are not so; but if you can prove any real impossiblities which this Doctrine forceth us to believe, I must yield, for we joyn with you in condemning the* Lutheran *Opinion that Christs Body is every where, because it is an impossibility: and we therefore expounded those words,* I am the Vine, I am the Door, *&c. figuratively, because it it impossible for him who is a Man, to be a Vine, or a Door* †.

Prot. And it is no less impossible for the Bread to be Christs Body: Why might not the Vine (as well as the Wine) be by Transubstantiation converted into Christs Substance? I think the Mother is as good as the Daughter; and especially since Christ saith, *I am the true Vine*, you might as well have devised another

† A Popish Book called, *Scripture mistaken*, p. 276.

Transubstantaition to make Christs words good. I know what work you would have made of it, if he had said, *This is my TRUE Body*, or *my TRUE Blood.*

But to give that over, I will shew you that there is such an heap of Contradictions, as never met together in the most absurd Opinion that ever was in the World; I profess (when I set my Wit at work) I cannot devise greater Absurdities than you believe. Tell me; do you hold that the whole Body of Christ is present in every Crumb of the Bread, and in every drop of the Wine?

Pop. *Yes doubtless, Christ is there entire and undivided.*

Prot. I suppose you believe that Christs Body is in Heaven, in such a proportion or brightness as he had upon Earth.

Pop. *No doubt of that.*

Prot. Then the same Body of Christ is bigger than it self, and longer than it self; and which is yet worse, Christ is divided from himself. I know not what can be more impossible, than to say, that all Christ is at *Rome*, and all at *London*, and all in Heaven, and yet not in the places between.

Pop. *All that is by Gods Almighty power.*

Prot. Then I suppose, by the same Almighty Power, it is possible for any other man to be in so many places; for it matters not that Christ be invisibly in so many places, and another should be there visible; or that Christ is there in so little a bulk, and another must be in a greater.

Pop. *I must needs grant that; and I affirm it*

is not abſolutely impoſſible for any other man to be at ſeveral places at once by Gods power.

Prot. Then mark what Monſters follow from this: ſuppoſe now *John* to be by Divine Power at the ſame time at *Rome*, at *Paris*, and at *London*; where ever *John* is alive, I ſuppoſe he hath a power to move himſelf.

Pop. *That muſt needs be, elſe be were not a living Creature.*

Prot. Then *John* at *Rome* may walk towards *London*, and *John* at *London* may walk towards *Rome*, and ſo they may meet (ſhall I ſay, *one the other?*) and you may be ſure it will be a merry meeting: It were worth enquiry, how long they will be ere they come together. Then again, at *Rome* all the parts of *John* may be exceſſively hot, and at *London* exceſſively cold, and at *Paris* neither hot not cold: This is beyond all the Romances that ever were deviſed. Beſides *John* may be ſorely wounded at *Rome*, and yet at *London* he may ſleep in a whole Skin: *John* may be feaſting at *Rome*, and faſting at *London* in the ſame moment. I might be infinite in reckoning the horrid Abſurdities of this Doctrine, he that can believe theſe things, will ſtick at nothing.

Pop. *You talk at this rate, becauſe you meaſure God by your ſelves: whereas he can do more than you or I can do.*

Prot. There are ſome things which it is no Diſhonour to God, to ſay he cannot do them, becauſe they are either ſinful (ſo God cannot lie) or abſolutely impoſſible: God himſelf cannot make a man to be alive and dead at the ſame time: God cannot make the whole to be leſs

than a part of it; he cannot make three t
be more than threescore; he cannot make
Son to beget his Father; he cannot make th
same Man to be born at two several times (a
your Authors confess); and therefore in lik
manner he cannot make the same Body to b
in two several places; for this is not one jot le
impossible than the other.

Pop. *These indeed are great difficulties to hu
mane Reason, but Reason is not to be believed
against Scripture.*

Prot. True; but this is your hard hap; thi
Doctrine of yours is against Scripture as wel
as Reason, and indeed against many Articles o
Religion.

And first, It is against the Scripture, in as much
as it is highly dishonourable to Christ, whose Ho
nour is the great design of the Scripture. Wha
a foul Dishonour is it to him to subject him to
the will of every Mass-Priest, who when he
pleaseth, can command him down into the
Bread? What a Dishonour is it, *That the very
Body of Christ may be eaten by Rats or Worms,
and may be cast up by Vomit*, and the like, as
your *Aquinas* affirms *? And that your Church
in her *Missals* hath put this amongst other Di
rections, *That if Worms or Rats have eaten
Christs Body, they must be burned; and if any
man vomit it up, it must be eaten again, or burn
ed, or made a Relick* †; and yet this is no more
than your Doctrine will force you to own; for
if you will believe Christs words, in one place as

* *Sum. qu.* 80 *art.* 3. † *Can.* 39. *Gloss. in
Can c.* 2. *de Consecratione.*

well

well as in another, he assures us, that *whatsoever* (without Exception) *entreth into the mouth, goeth into the Belly, and is cast forth into the draught*, Matt. 15. 17.

Pop. *This is no more dishonourable to Christ, than that the Flock might suck his Blood when he was upon Earth.*

Prot. You mistake wofully; for tho in the days of his Flesh, it was no dishonour to him (and it was necessary for us) that he suffered so many Indignities, and died, and was crucified; yet now, that he is risen from the dead, *He dies no more*, Rom. 6. and it is a dishonour to him to be crucified again, and to be brought back again to those Reproaches which he long since left; and all this to no purpose, and without any profit to us, (as I shewed). Again, the Scripture approveth and useth this Argument, that a Body cannot be in two places at once; it is the Angels argument, *He is not here, for he is risen*, Mat. 28. 6. sufficiently implying, that he could not be here and there too; or must we say, that the Angels Argument is weak or deceitful, that yours may be strong and true?

Pop. *He meant he was not there visibly.*

Prot. It seems, if a man being sought after, should hide himself with you in some Corner or Hole in your Room, and the Pursuers should ask for him, you could answer with good Conscience, *He is not here*, because he is invisible. Our blessed Saviour every where makes these two opposite, his being in the World, and going into Heaven, Joh. 13. 1. *The Hour was come that he should depart out of this World unto the*

Father: It seems you could have taught him the art of going thither, and keeping here too. I promise you, I durst not venture to buy an Estate of any of you, for it seems you could tell how to sell it to me, and keep it to your selves. You may remember, once you and I made our selves merry with a Passage that one used in a Speech, That since he could not give content, neither by *going* or *staying*, hereafter he would neither *go* nor *stay*. It seems you have as good a faculty as he had; for you know how a man may both *go from a place*, and *stay in it* at the same time. I know not what can be more plain if you did not shut your Eyes. Christ saith expressly, *Me you have not always*; that is, *here*, *Matt.* 26. 11. Besides, your Doctrine destroys the truth of Christs Human Nature. I read of Christ, that he *was in all points like unto us*, *Sin only excepted*; his Body was like ours, and therefore it is impossible it should be in a thousand several places at once, (as you pretend it is); this turns Christs Body into a Spirit; nay, indeed you make his Body more spiritual than a Spirit; for a Spirit cannot be in several places divided from its self. The Soul of Man, if it be entire both in the whole and in every part of the Body, yet is not divided from its self, nor from its Body, nor can it be in two several Bodies at the same time, as all confess; and much less can it be in ten thousand Bodies at once (as by your Argument undoubtedly it may); whenever an Angel comes to Earth, he leaves Heaven; and so this every way destroys the truth of Christs Human Body.

Pop.

Pop. *Much of what you say was true of Christs Body in the days of his infirmity; but when he was risen from the Dead, then he received a Spiritual Body, as it is said ours shall be at the Resurrection,* 1 Cor. 15.

Prot. To this I answer, First, that you ascribe these monstrous properties to Christs Body before its Resurrection; for you say, The Flesh and Blood of Christ were really in the Sacrament, which the Disciples received while Christ lived. Secondly, Christs Resurrection tho it heightned the perfection, yet it did not alter the Nature and Properties of his Body, nor give it the being of a Spirit; for after he was risen, he proves that he was no Spirit, by this Argument, *Handle me and see, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones as you see me have,* Luk 24 39. By this it appears, that your Doctrine destroys the truth of Christs Humanity, at least it destroies the main evidence of it (against those who affirmed, that Christ had only a phantastical Body) namely, that he was seen, and felt, and heard; for you say, Sense is not to be believed. Again, you destroy the Truth of Christs Ascension into Heaven. For Christ is not ascended, if he hath not left the World; for these two are joyned together, Joh. 16 28. *I leave the World, and go to the Father*; but it you say true, he hath not left the World, but is here in every Sacrament; nothing can be more plain, than that Christ did visibly and locally leave this World when he went up into Heaven, *Acts* 1. 9, 10. that being once there, *the Heavens must receive* (or *contain*) *him, until the time of the restitution of all things,* Act 3. 21; and that at

the laſt day he ſhall come viſibly and locally from Heaven, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 7. but that he ſhould come down a thouſand times in a day, at the command of every Maſs-Prieſt, is ſuch a dream as the Scripture ſpeaks not one ſyllable of, nor can any rational Man believe it. Moreover your Doctrine deſtroys the very Eſſence of a Sacrament, which conſiſts of two parts, an outward Element or Sign, and the inward Grace ſignified by it; and this I am told your Doctors acknowledg *. I ſhall forbear mentioning further particulars, theſe are more than enough to ſhew the falſneſs of this Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.

In the next place, pray let me hear what you have to ſay for your great Article of praying to Saints.

But firſt, I am told divers of your own Authors confeſs, it is not neceſſary to pray to Saints, but only convenient. Is it ſo?

Pop. *It is true, and I muſt confeſs the Council of* Trent *do only ſay*, It is good and profitable ||.

Prot. Then ſure, I will never run the hazard of committing Idolatry for an unneceſſary work. But I am further told, that your great Scholar and Wit, *Perron*, confeſſeth, That *he found no footſteps of this praying to Saints, either in Scripture, or in the Fathers before the four firſt Councils*, (which was ſome hundreds of years after Chriſt ‡. He confeſſeth likewiſe to *Iſaac Caſaubone*, (as he told our Biſhop *Andrews*) that he himſelf never prayed to Saints but only as he

* *Bell. de Sacramentis in genere, lib.* 1. *c.* 9 & 11. || *De Invocat. ſanct.* ‡ *Lib.* 1. *c.* 18.

went

went in Proceſſion, *that is*, for form ſake, *Andr. in Opuſc Poſthuma*: and that *Salmeron* and *Cotton* *, and *Eccius*, ſay as much in effect, *viz.* That *there is no command for this in either Teſtament.* Is it ſo?

Pop. *It is true*; *and* Bellarmin *confeſſeth*, *That* the Saints began to be worſhipt, not ſo much by any Law, as by Cuſtom ‡.

Prot. Methinks theſe two Conſiderations ſhould ſtartle you, that it is both unneceſſary and uncommanded. I perceive I am not like to hear Scripture-Arguments in this point.

Pop. *Some of our Authors do urge ſome Scriptures; but you tye me up to uſe but few, and thoſe the beſt Arguments; and therefore I will rather urge other Conſiderations.*

1. *Humility and Diſcretion adviſeth us to this Duty: for I ſuppoſe, if you have any requeſt to the King, you do not ſawcily ruſh into his preſence, but make uſe of ſome of his Courtiers.*

Prot. But tell me, I pray you, If a King not only allows, but commands all his Subjects to *call upon him in the day of trouble, to come to him freely*; and upon all occaſions, *to pour out Complaints to him, not doubting but he will receive and anſwer them*; and this King were always at perfect leiſure to hear their requeſts, and the oftner they come to him, the welcomer they are; and he appoints his own Son the Maſter of the Requeſts, from time to time, to receive all the Petitions of his Subjects; and both the King and the Prince are Ten thouſand times more

* *Inſtitut.* 1. *Book.* ‡ *Beatit. ſanctorum, l.* 1. *c.* 8. *Sect. ult.*

compaſſionate than the Courtiers; would you not in this caſe account him a fool (and ſomewhat elſe too) that ſhould ſpend his time in Petitioning this and the other inferior Courtier to gain acceſs to the King?

Pop. *I cannot deny that.*

Prot. Then your Church hath need to make uſe of that Counſel, *Jam.* 1. 5. *If any man want wiſdom, let him ask it of God*; they rather chuſe to ask it of Saints, and that is the reaſon they go without it. Moſt plain it is, this is the very caſe; and ſuch a King God in all point is, and infinitely better than all this; and ſuch a Maſter of Requeſts Chriſt is; but for the Humility you talk of, I think therein you do imprudently; for I remember the worſhip of Angels came in under a ſhew of Humility, *Col.* 2. 18 and the Door being once opened, it was diſcreetly done to bring in the Worſhip of Saints there too; let me hear what elſe you can ſay?

Pop. *We uſe to pray to living Saints, why not as well to departed and glorified Saints?* St. Paul *writes to the* Theſſalonians, Pray for us, *Col.* 4. 3.

Prot. Surely Scripture makes a ſufficient difference; you meet with very many Commands and Examples of Prayers, or Addreſſes to the living, not one to the dead. Beſides, you know the living hear your Prayers, you know nothing that the dead do ſo: Beſides, I trow you do not pray to the living in ſuch manner as you do the dead; you do not Religiouſly worſhip the living (and about that all our queſtion is). Did St. *Paul* invocate the *Coloſſians*, be-

cauſe he deſired their Prayers? Can you ſay any thing more?

Pop. *The Saints in Glory pray for us, and therefore we may pray unto them.*

Prot. Will you affirm, that I may and ought to worſhip, and pray unto all thoſe that pray for me?

Pop. *No: Then our Churches practice would condemn me; for we grant, that the Fathers in their Limbus did, and ſo thoſe in Purgatory* do, *pray for us, and ſo do all the living Saints upon Earth, yet we do not allow Prayers unto them.*

Prot. Then your Argument is loſt, from their Interceſſion to your Invocation.

Pop. *Let me hear, if you have any better Arguments againſt this practice.*

Prot. You ſhall. 1. Since all grant that Prayer is a part of Gods Worſhip, then your praying to Saints is directly contrary to Gods command, Deut. 6. 13. Mat. 4. 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.*

Pop. *We do not worſhip the Saints, as God, with the higheſt kind of Worſhip, which is proper to God, but only with an inferior kind of Religious Worſhip, and therefore do not tranſgreſs this command.*

Prot. The devil himſelf did not require the higheſt Worſhip, as I ſhewed before; yet Chriſt thought that inferior Worſhip a breach of that Law. Nor did thoſe Angel-worſhippers mentioned, *Col.* 2. worſhip the Angels as God, with the higheſt worſhip, for they were either *Jews*, or Judaizing Chriſtians, (both of which never pretend to equalize the Angels with God, but

judg

judged them far inferior to God, and worshipped them accordingly); yet nevertheless are they condemned by St. *Paul* for giving Divine Honour to the Creature. Next, this praying to Saints is an high dishonour to Jesus Christ. God hath made him *the only Mediator*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. he hath invited all Persons to come freely and boldly to him; hath promised *those that come to him, he will in no wise cast out*, Joh. 6. 37. Why do you not then go immediately to Christ? This is a manifest questioning either of his Power, or Faithfulness, or Goodness.

Pop. *It is one of the Slanders of your Ministers, that we dishonour Christ; we only pray to Saints to pray to Christ.*

Prot. All your Books of Devotion confutes that Pretence; for you profess in your Mass-book * they help you by their Merits, as well as by their Prayers. *Bellarmin* affirmeth, that the *Saints in some sorts are our Redeemers* ‡. Is this no more than only to pray for you? Is it no more than this, when you pray thus to the Virgin *Mary? Do thou protect us; drive away evil from us, and require good things for us.* And, *in right of a Mother, command thy Son?* Is it no more than this, when you say, *The Lord was with her*, (*i. e.* the Virgin *Mary*) *and she with the Lord in the same work of Redemption.* And when *Isa* 63. 3. is objected, *I trod the Wine-press alone, and there was no man with me*; they answer cunningly, *True, Lord, there was no* MAN

* *Quorum meritis precibusque rogamus.*

‡ *De indulgentis, l.* 1. *c.* 4.

with

with thee, but there was a WOMAN *with thee* *; Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt that your famous *Biel* ſaith, *That God hath given the Virgin* Mary *half of his Kingdom; and that whereas he hath Juſtice and Mercy, he kept Juſtice to himſelf, and granted Mercy to the Virgin* ‡? In my Opinion they ſhall do well to take in Chriſt for a ſhare in the Mercy. Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt to ſay, *That Prayers which are made to, and delivered by the Saints, are better than thoſe by Chriſt,* as *Salmeron* ſaith ||? Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt, that *Barradius* the Jeſuit asketh of Chriſt, *Why he took not his Mother up with him when he aſcended up to Heaven?* and frames this anſwer *, *Peradventure, Lord, it was left thy Heavenly Courtiers ſhould be in doubt, whether to go out to meet thee their Lord, or her their Lady.* Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt, that *Carolus Scribarius* (otherwiſe *Clarus Bonarſius*) profeſſeth, *He cannot tell which to prefer, the Mothers Milk, or the Sons Blood* ‡. I believe neither Chriſt nor his Mother will give theſe Men thanks for this another day: And all theſe paſſages are not in obſcure Authors, that privily ſteal abroad into the World; but in Eminent Perſons, and Books Licenſed by the Approbation, and according to the Order of your Church; and beſides, your Church owns them, in that She doth not blot them out, nor put them into her expurgatory Indices. Moreover, I muſt pray to

* *In Martali, Ann.* 1493. ‡ *In Canone Miſſæ, Sect* 80. || *In* 1 *Tim* 2. *diſ.* 8. *p.* 467. * *Concord. Evan. Tom.* 1. *l.* 6 *c.* 11. ‡ *In Amphitheatro honoris.*

none,

none, but those in whom I must trust, *Rom.* 10. 13, 14. *How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?* And trust is Gods Prerogative, incommunicable to any Creature, *Jer.* 17. 5. *Cursed is he that trusteth in man.* Again, I must pray to none, but to whom I may pray in Faith, and without doubting; and (upon good grounds, *believing that I shall receive,*) *Mat.* 21. 22. *Jam.* 1. 5, 6. But I am not sure that the Saints do hear my Prayers, or can and will grant them.

Pop. *The Saints in Glory do know what we pray to them for.*

Prot. How doth that appear?

Pop. *There are several ways whereby they know these things, but I adhere to what* Bellarmin *saith, that they know this by revelation from God.*

Prot. You should not only say this, but prove it. One of your infallible Popes, *Gregory*, denies this, no Scripture informs you thus much; nay that sufficiently implies, that the Saints do not particularly know, nor mind the concerns of this World. God tells *Josiah*, 2 Chron. 34. 28. *Thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace, neither shall thine eyes see the evil I will bring upon this place.* Eccl. 9. 5. *The dead know not any thing* of the particular occurences of this Life, see *Job* 14. 21. I am sure these are ten times better Arguments than what you bring for the contrary. And in a word, It is Gods incommunicable Prerogative to know the Heart, and secret Prayers, 2 *Chron.* 9. 30. *Matt.* 6. 6. So upon the whole matter, I conclude, and now by the vanity of your Arguments and Answers, do fully discern the falseness of this Opinion, and the

the wickedneſs of the practice of calling upon Saints; let me hear whether you have any better Evidences for the worſhip of Images; I hope you have; and I am ſure you need very clear and ſtrong Arguments for that Practice, or elſe you are guilty of that damnable Sin of Idolatry.

Pop. *We have very good Arguments for that: I will uſe only two, and thoſe our ſtrongeſt Arguments, as you deſire. Firſt, we have the example and command of God for it; he cauſed the Images of the Cherubims to be made, and put upon the Ark which was to be worſhipped,* Pſal. 98. *if the Ark was to be worſhipped becauſe it repreſented Gods footſtool, much more may an Image be worſhipped, as our Mr.* Biſhop *rightly argued* *.

Prot. I ſuppoſe if this be a good Argument to *us now*, it was ſo to the *Jews formerly*; for length of time doth not turn falſe Arguments into true ones; tell me therefore if you had lived when the Law, *Exod.* 20. was newly given, and one had perſwaded you to worſhip Images, by your own Argument what would you have anſwered?

Pop. *I would have ſaid, it doth not follow that becauſe the Ark was to be worſhipped (which God commanded them to worſhip) therefore Images were to be worſhipped, (which God forbad them to worſhip.)*

Prot. Good Sir, beſtow this Anſwer (as a token from me) upon any of your Brethren that ſhall argue ſo abſurdly; beſides, it ſeems

* Againſt *Perkins* of Images.

very

very unlikely to me, that the Cherubims were ordained to be worſhipped by the People, becauſe they were never ſeen by the People. You put the Images which you worſhip in the moſt viſible and conſpicuous Places.

Pop. *Yet no man could Worſhip the Ark, but he muſt Worſhip the Cherubims, for they were over the Ark.*

Prot. In that caſe the Cherubims were not at all worſhipped, unleſs you will ſay, that he that worſhips one of your Wooden Images, worſhips alſo the Spider (which peradventure is paying its Devotion there, and got into the Saints Mouth). Beſides, it doth not appear that the Ark it ſelf was worſhipped, for that alſo was not ſo much as ſeen by the People, therefore not like to be worſhipped. All that we read, is, That the *Iſraelites* did and ought to worſhip God toward the Ark; and ſo they are ſaid to worſhip God *toward the whole Temple, and toward* Jeruſalem, *and towards the Holy Mountain, and towards Heaven.* Yet I preſume you will not ſay all theſe places were to be worſhipped; and if God was to be worſhipped towards theſe places, becauſe he tells us expreſly, his ſpecial Preſence was there; What is this to Images, which God baniſhed from his Houſe and Preſence? And to conclude this, I pray you tell me, Is it lawful to worſhip every place where God is in a ſpecial manner preſent?

Pop. *I conceive it is.*

Prot. Then it is lawful to Worſhip every religious Man in the World. It is true, your great *Vaſquez* profeſſeth, that a Man may worſhip a Stone

Stone, or a Straw, or any Creature where God is, for God is there according to his Eſſence *. By which Argument it ſeems Chriſt might have worſhipped the Devil; for the Eſſence of God being every where, muſt needs be in him. But what, I pray, is your other Argument?

Pop. The Honour of God requires the Worſhip of his Image, for that redounds to God; as if I Honour a Prince, I will Honour his Picture; and we ſhew our Reverence to the King in being uncovered in his Preſence-Chamber, tho the King be not there.

Prot. Tell me, I pray you, If a King forbid any Picture of himſelf to be made or ſet up; if any over-officious Subject ſhould, notwithſtanding this, ſet up the Kings Picture, pretending to do it in reſpect to the King, would the King eſteem himſelf Honoured or Diſhonoured by it?

Pop. *In that caſe certainly the King is diſhonoured when his Commands are broken, and his Authority deſpiſed.*

Prot. You ſay right. And ſo God will give you little thanks for breaking his Commands, upon pretence of his Service. If a King require ſuch Reverence to be given to his Preſence-Chamber, it is fit that he ſhould be obeyed, (ſeeing it is only a civil and not a religious Reſpect); and if God forbid any ſuch Reverence, any Religious Worſhip ſhould be given to any Graven Images, good reaſon his Prohibition too ſhould be obeyed. You talk of honouring

* *De Adoratione, l. 3. diſ. 3. cap. 2. pag.* 455. & 458.

God,

God, but for the way or means of honouring God, whether it be most reasonable to take an estimate from the Rules and Practices of all former Idolaters (who have all justified their Idolatry from this pretence of honouring God) or from the Commands of Gods Word, and the practices of the godly *Jews* before Christ, and godly Christians and Fathers, for some hundreds of years after Christ (who are all knnwn to detest all manner of Worship of Images) *, I leave to any indifferent Person to judg; besides, if you will needs testifie your respect to God, by honouring his Images, what a madness is it to confine this honour to dead Images of Wood or Stone, and to deny it to his Saints upon Earth, who are his living, and far more noble and express Images?

Pop. *Since you scorn my Arguments, for the Worship of Images, let me hear your Arguments against it.*

Prot. My first Argument is this, The Holy Scripture condemns it as Idolatry.

Pop. *We have Images in our Churches only as remembrancers (to put us in mind of worthy and excellent Persons) but not as objects of Worship.*

Prot. No, Friend, it is not that time of day; you cannot now deceive us with such foolish excuses; for your Councils of *Nice* and *Trent* do both command the worshipping of Images, and all your Authors plead for this.

Pop. *Well, but this I am sure is true, we do not worship the Images, but only God by them, and in them; we worship them only as representations of*

* See *Dallæus de Imaginibus.*

God

God or Chriſt, &c. and the honour paſſeth from them to God.

Prot. That cannot acquit you neither, before God nor Man. *Micah* and his Mother were guilty of Idolatry, yet the Silver was *dedicated to the Lord* (Jehovah) *to make a graven Image*, Judg. 17. 3 alſo Judg. 18 5, 6. And the *Iſraelites* are charged with Idolatry in the worſhipping of the Golden Calf, *Acts* 7. 41. 1 *Cor.* 10. 7. And yet they could not be ſo brutiſh, as to think that Golden Calf, which *they brought* out of *Egypt* in their *Ear-rings*, was that God which *brought them* out of *Egypt* with ſtrong hand.

Pop. *But they ſaid*, Theſe be thy Gods, O *Iſrael*, which brought thee up out of the Land of *Egypt*.

Prot. You uſe alſo to call an Image by the Name of him whom it Repreſents; you commonly ſay, this is *the bleſſed Virgin*, or St. *Matthew*, *&c.* when you mean, 'tis only their Image; and ſo it cannot be ſtrange to you that they expreſs themſelves in the ſame manner. Beſides, *Aaron* himſelf proclaims the feaſt of the Calf in theſe words, *To morrow is a feaſt to Jehovah*: The Heathens alſo excuſed their Idolatry by this very pretence. So *Celſus* * and others ſaid (as the ancient Fathers tell us), *We do not worſhip the Images of Gold or Braſs*, &c. *as believing them to be Gods*; *but we worſhip the gods in them, and by them.*

Pop. *They worſhipped wicked Men, but we*

* *Lib.* 7 *contra Celſum. Arnobius lib.* 6. *Lactant. l.* 2. *c* 2. *Euſebius de paratione Evangelica, lib.* 3. *& lib* 4. *in Præfat.*

worſhip

worſhip only holy Men, and the Friends of God as ſuch, and becauſe they are ſuch, and their Images; and therefore are not guilty of Idolatry.

Prot. Then St. *Peter*, *Act.* 10. and the Angel, *Rev.* 22. and St. *Paul*, *Act.* 14. might have received that Adoration (as being the Friends of God) which they ſo utterly rejected. *Moſes* was the friend of God, yet God hid away his Body, leſt the *Iſraelites* ſhould worſhip him. And I have heard that the Fathers charged the *Collidrians* with Idolatry, for worſhipping of the Virgin *Mary* ‡; and the *Arrians* for worſhipping Chriſt, whom they believed to be but a Creature (tho all agree they were the Friends of God). I ſuppoſe if any Man ſhould attempt to give the honour proper to the King, to his Brother, or Friend, this would not excuſe them from Treaſon; nor will it excuſe any Adultereſs that ſhe lay with her Husbands deareſt Friend or Relation. Again, it matters not much to this point, for what reaſon you worſhip Images; the only Queſtion is, whether you do worſhip Images? For the very doing of that (whatſoever pretences it may have) is Idolatry. Beſides, if you worſhipped God alone, and not the Image, your excuſe would have ſome Colour; but it is moſt evident, that you worſhip not only God, but the Image too. I am told that your own *Azorius* affirms, That *it is the conſtant Opinion of your Divines, that the Image is to be honoured and worſhipped with the ſame Honour and Worſhip which is given to him whoſe*

‡ *Ephiphanius Hereſi*, 97. *per totum.*

Image

Image it is *. And that *Cajetan* ‡ and *Gregory de Valentia* ||, and *Coſterus* ∴ affirms as much. And that your *Bellarmin* expreſly diſputes for this, that *Images are not only to be worſhipped as they are exemplars; but alſo properly and by themſelves, ſo as the worſhip may be terminated in them* †. Are theſe things true?

Pop. *I cannot deny but they are.*

Prot. Then I ſee the Vanity of your Pretences, and that you only ſeek to raiſe a miſt before the Eyes of ignorant People, for in truth you worſhip the Image it ſelf, tho happily not for its ſelf: as if a Heathen Emperor commanded his Subjects Religiouſly to Worſhip ſuch a Vicegerent of his; no Man, who did worſhip the Vicegerent, could deny that he worſhipped him, tho he did did it only for the Emperors ſake. Tell me, I pray you, do you not hold, that there are two kinds of Religious Worſhip; namely, abſolute, (which you give to God or the Saints) and relative, which you give to their Images?

Pop. *I muſt own it.*

Prot. Then it is horrible Impudence to ſay, You do not give Worſhip to the Images, ſince you give one of theſe two kinds unto them, and unto them only; beſides, if all you ſay were true, this would not acquit you from Idolatry; for your Church profeſſeth and commandeth the Worſhip of the Images of Saints, as well as of God and Chriſt; and ſince it is

* *Lib.* 9 *Inſtit. mor. c.* 6. *art.* 3. ‡ *In Thom. part.* 3. *qu.* 25. *art.* 3. || *Tom.* 3. *Diſp.* 6. *qu.* 11. *punct.* 6. ∴ *Enchirid. p.* 438. † *De Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 21. *prop.* 1.

Idolatry

Idolatry to give Divine Honour to any Creature (as I before proved) you are no less guilty in giving it to the Saints themselves, than to their Images, and so you are double-dy'd Idolaters.

My second Argument is taken from the second Commandment, *Thou shalt not make any graven Image.*

But first, I pray you tell me true, Hath your Church left out this second Commandment in divers of her Breviaries and Offices of Prayer? Or do our Ministers slander them? I hear, that in *The hours of our Lady*, Printed at *Paris*, *Anno* 1611. the Commandments of the first Table are set down in these words, and no other.

1. Commandment.

I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt not have nor worship any other God but me.

2. Commandment.

Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain.

3. Commandment.

Remember to keep holy the Sabbath-day, and Feasts.

And that the Council of *Ausburgh*, *Anno* 1548. delivering the Commandments in *Dutch* for the People, leave out the mention of Images; and that their cheat might not be discovered, that the People might have their full number, they make use of the mistake of one of the Fathers, and divide the last Command into two, against Sense and Reason, and the practice of the whole Ancient Church. Are these things so?

Pop. *It is true, it is left out in some of our Books,*

Books, but we leave it in, in all Bibles, and divers of our Catechisms.

Prot. Very well, I see you had wit in your anger; I commend your Discretion, that you did not your work so grosly, that all the World should cry shame of you; But that you blotted it out in any, is an evidence of your guilt. But what say you to this Argument?

Pop. *Then my first answer is, That this Command was peculiar to the* Jews, *who were most prone to Idolatry* *.

Prot. This is not true. It sufficiently appears that the Gentiles were under the Obligation of this Law, from those punishments which God inflicted upon them, for their Transgression or Breach of it by Idolatry, *Rom.* 1. *But where there is no Law, there is no transgression.* Besides, Christ tells us, *He came not to destroy the Law* (the Moral Law) *but to fulfil it*, Mat. 5. 17. Be-like you are not of his mind: And dare you say the *Jews* as soon as they believed in Christ, were discharged of this Command, and allowed to worship the Images which that Command forbad?

Pop. *I will not say so; but I have a second Answer, The thing prohibited here, is not* Images, *(which are Representations of real things) as you falsly render it; but* Idols, *which are the Images of false Gods, which are not, and never were in the World.*

Prot. The Text its self is full against you; for the Images there prohibited, are not said to be the Images of the false Gods of the Heathens

* Vasquez, *de Adoratione.*

(whereof

(whereof many never had any being) but the Images *of any thing in Heaven or Earth* &c. Moreover, divers of the Heathen Gods were Men who they deified. I hope their Pictures were Pictures of real things, yet theſe are Idols.

Pop. *Tho they really were Men, yet their Pictures were made to repreſent them as gods, and ſuch as they were not really, and therefore were Idols.*

Prot. The Learned Heathens knew (as well as you and I do) that *Jupiter*, and *Mars*, and *Mercury*, and the reſt, were meer Men, (and they ſmiled at the Ignorance of their Vulgar, that thought otherwiſe) only they thought of them juſt as you do of the Saints, that the great God had put ſome of his Honour upon them, and therefore they might worſhip them; you cannot be ſo ſilly to think, the Learned Heathens thought *Auguſtus* was a God really, when he was dead; yet their worſhip of his Image was Idolatry. And they that worſhipped the Image of *Caligula* (while he lived) were not ſo ſottiſh to take him for a God (whom they knew to be a fooliſh and wicked Man): yet I hope you will not excuſe them from Idolatry. But further, as the *Jews* did univerſally underſtand this to be a Prohibition of all manner of Images; ſo all the Prophets, and Chriſt, and the Apoſtles were ſo far from reproving them (which they would have done, if it had been an Error) that they every where ſtrengthen them in this Opinion, by declaiming againſt all worſhip of Images without any diſtinction. And tell me, I pray you, if any *Jew* had at that time made (for inſtance

ſtance) an Image of the Sun not looking on it as God, but as a glorious Creature of God, and therefore fit to be Religiouſly worſhipped (as you think of the Saints and Angels) and had bowed done to it and worſhipped it, Do you think he had not broken this Law?

Pop. *I dare not deny but he had broken it.*

Prot. Yet this had been no *Idol*, but an Image, according to your Senſe of it. Beſides, I find that all manner of Images are forbidden, *Lev.* 26. 1. howſoever, to me you ſeem to venture your Salvation upon a nice Point, for the *Hebrew* word is neither *Image* nor *Idol*, but *Peſel*, as a *Divine* told me; and this, I underſtand is diverſly tranſlated; ſome render it an *Image*, others an *Idol*. Now you venture your Soul upon it, that the laſt is the only true Tranſlation, which is a dreaful hazard because it is otherwiſe rendred, not only by Proteſtants, but by the moſt and beſt ancient Intepreters *, even thoſe whom your Vulgar Tranſlation very oft follow in other places. Theſe render it not an *Idol*, but a *Graven Image*; and the Seventy Interpreters (I am aſſured) do promiſcuouſly render the word ſometimes *an Idol*, ſometimes *a Graven Image*: Nay more than this, that it may appear how deſperate your cauſe is, I am informed your own Vulgar Tranſlation (from which you are obliged not to ſwerve) doth frequently render it not *Idol*, but *a Graven Image, (Sculptile)* particularly in *Exod.* 20. 4. *Levit.* 26. 1. and *Deut.* 4. 16, 25. and 5. 8. Are theſe thing ſo?

* *Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion: Sic Joſephus εἰκων Philo ἀγαλμα.*

Pop. *I cannot deny it, for the Authors themſelves would confute me. But one thing I have to ſay, you muſt underſtand one Scripture, ſo as to agree with another: Now I find God himſelf allows and preſcribes ſome Images, as thoſe of the Cherubims; either then he contradicts himſelf, or doth not forbid all Images, but Idols only.*

Prot. Tho I might ſay, God may make an Exception to ſome of his Laws, when no man can, (as in the caſe of *Abraham*'s Offering up *Iſaac*, and the *Iſraelites* ſpoiling the *Egyptians* of their Jewels) yet I need no other anſwer but this, I directly deny that here is any Contradiction at all. For our queſtion is not about the making of Images (whether by Gods order, or Mans), but about the worſhipping of them. And albeit there were ſuch Images made, yet they were not made to be worſhipped, as I before proved; nor was there any danger the People ſhould worſhip them, becauſe they were not admitted to ſee them. But I pray you anſwer me this one queſtion, I am told that divers of your own Authors confeſs, that the *Jews* in deed were, tho Chriſtians are not forbidden the uſe of Images by this command. Is it ſo?

Pop. *Theſe indeed are the Words of our famous* Vaſquez, *after he hath mentioned divers Authors for the contrary Opinion.* There are *(ſaith he)* other Authors, neither fewer, nor inferior to them, who are of the contrary Opinion, which to me always ſeemed moſt probable, to wit, that all the uſe of Images is not forbidden to the *Jews* *, *and for this he quo-*

* *De Adorat. l. 2. def. 4. c. 2.*

many of our approved Authors; *and* Salmeron *ſaith no leſs* *.

Prot. And you need ſay no more; for then all theſe Authors thought your Diſtinction of *Image* and *Idol* frivolous, and that the word *Peſel* is meant of any *Images*, and not of *Idols* only, as you fooliſhly diſtinguiſh; and ſo your principal refuge is loſt, and you are convicted Idolaters, and then, if you repent not, you know where your Portion will be. *Go now and brag of the ſafeneſs of your Religion.*

I ſee how little it is that you can ſay for your Worſhip of the Dead (Saints and their Images) let me hear whether you have any better Arguments for your Prayers for the Dead and Purgatory.

Pop. *I am glad you mention that, ſince all your Divines do agree, that Prayer for the Dead was the practice of the Ancient Church and Fathers.*

Prot. If that be true, it is not ſufficient for your purpoſe, for I am fully ſatisfied that the Fathers were not Infallible, and your own greateſt Doctors think ſo too ‡. But beſides, I am told that their Prayers for the Dead were quite of another nature than yours, and for other purpoſes, and they were grounded upon ſome private Opinions of theirs, which you diſown; for they prayed not only for thoſe whom you ſuppoſe to be in Purgatory, but for thoſe who (you confeſs) many of them never did come there; they pray *for all the Saints*, *from the righteous* Abel *to this day*; they pray *for all their Ance-*

* *In* Rom. *diſ.* 29. *ſect. prima.* ‡ See *Nullity*, *c.* 3.

ſtors, Patriarchs, Prophets and Martyrs, a
have heard it in ſome of their Liturgies. I
ſo?

I pray you tell me, why do you pray for t
Dead?

Pop. *We pray that God would deliver th
from thoſe dreadful pains of Purgatory.*

Prot. Then if there be no Purgatory, t
Foundation of your Prayer for the Dead
gone.

Pop *I grant it.*

Prot. Then let us diſcourſe of the moſt fu
damental Point, (as we have hitherto don
the reſt will fall of courſe. Therefore

Firſt, I pray you tell me your Opinion co
cerning Purgatory.

Pop. *Our Doctrine in brief is this*: That t
God freely gives to all that are truly Penite
forgiveneſs of their Sins, and freedom from ete
nal Death; yet ſince they have much venial Si
and Corruption in them, in which oft-time
they die; therefore it is neceſſary that th
ſhould for the Expiation of thoſe Sins, and fo
the Satisfaction of Gods Juſtice, either do o
ſuffer ſuch Penances, Faſtings, Prayers, &c. a
are injoyned them here, or (*where thoſe are n
ſufficient*) ſuffer the pains of Purgatory.

Prot. I underſtand your Doctrine; now le
me hear two of your ſtrongeſt Arguments t
prove it. I hear that *Bellarmin* threatens us,
that *whoſoever doth not believe Purgatory, ſha
be tormented in Hell* *. Is it true?

Pop. *He doth ſay ſo, and I am of his mind.*

* *Bell. de Purgat. l.* 1. *c. ult.*

Pro

Prot. Then I hope you have very clear Arguments for it, becauſe you lay ſo great a ſtreſs upon it. But firſt, I have heard that this Doctrine of Purgatory is confeſſed by divers of your own Brethren to be but a new Doctrine. Is it ſo?

Pop. *I will not diſſemble with you, ſeveral of our Doctors have unadviſedly blurted out ſuch expreſſions as theſe; our famous* Engliſh *Martyr* Fiſher *Biſhop of* Rocheſter *confeſſeth, That* Purgatory was for a long time unknown, and either never or very ſeldom mentioned among the Ancient Fathers *; *and* Alphonſus de Caſtro *ſaith, That* many things are known to us, of which the Ancient Writers were altogether ignorant ‡; *and amongſt them he reckons Purgatory,* which *(ſaith he)* the Greek Writers mentioned not, and even to this day it is not believed by the *Greek* Church.

Prot. I ſuppoſe you do not think all theſe Ancient Fathers were damned.

Pop. *No, God forbid, for many of them were glorious Confeſſors and Martyrs.*

Prot. Then I ſee *Bellarmins* threats are not very formidable. But to let this paſs, How do you prove this Doctrine?

Pop. *From plain Scripture*: 1. *From* Mat. 12. 32. Whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this, neither in the World to come. *Which clearly implies, that ſome ſins not forgiven in this World, are forgiven in the next, and that muſt be in Purgatory.*

* *In Conſul. Luther. art.* 18. ‡ *Adv. hæreſes, l.* 12. *tit. Purgat f.* 258.

Prot. I pray you tell me, what Sins are they which are forgiven in Purgatory?

Pop. *Not great and mortal, but ſmall and venial Sins, as we all agree.*

Prot. Is not Blaſphemy againſt the Son of Man a mortal Sin?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs: But what of that?*

Prot. If this Text proves the Pardon of any Sins, it proves the Pardon of that Sin no leſs than others, becauſe the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt is here ſpoken of as the only Sin which is unpardonable in both Worlds: Beſides, Chriſt ſpeaks thus in oppoſition to a corrupt Opinion, which I have heard, now is, and then was riſe among the *Jews*, to wit, that divers of their Sins were pardoned after this Life, and that this was one of their ancient Prayers, *Let my Death be the Expiation of all my Sins*; for they thought the ſufferings of this Life and Death the laſt of them, did free them from the Puniſhments of the other Life. And I have heard that it was one of their ſayings, That *every* Iſraelite *hath a part in the future Life*: Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *To deal freely with you, This is not only true, but it is one of our Arguments for Purgatory, that* Jaſon *the* Cyrenian *(who lived long before Chriſt's time) expreſly affirms, That* it is profitable to pray for the Dead, that their Sins may be pardoned, 2 *Mac.* 12.

Prot. I think that is impertinently alledged for Purgatory; for the Sin thoſe men died in was a mortal Sin, (as you confeſs) and therefore not pardonable in Purgatory. But I thank you for this; for now I am ſatisfied that it was an ancient

ancient Opinion among the *Jews*, and ſo Chriſt had juſt occaſion to uſe this Expreſſion to confute that vain Expectation of theirs. But beſides, the meaning of this phraſe. *Shall not be forgiven*, is, that *it ſhall be puniſhed in both Worlds*; this is a frequent Phraſe in Scripture. Thus *Exod.* 20. 7. *God will not hold him guiltleſs*, that is, he will ſeverely puniſh. *To accept Perſons in Judgment is not good*; that is, *is very bad. The Father of a fool rejoyceth not*; that is, *grieveth much.* I hear St. *Chryſoſtom* expounds it thus *, and a greater than he, St. *Mark* 3. 29. *He hath never forgiveneſs, but is in danger of eternal Damnation.*

Beſides all this, we all agree that there is a kind of forgiveneſs of Sin after this Life, and at the day of Judgment, Acts 3. 19. *Repent, that yours Sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreſhing ſhall come from the Preſence of the Lord*; for then indeed the pardon of Sin is compleated and fully manifeſted. And it is a common phraſe in Scripture to ſpeak of a thing as done, when it is only declared and manifeſted, as the Apoſtle ſaith, thoſe words, Pſal. 2. *This day have I begotten thee*, were fulfilled in Chriſts Reſurrection, *Acts* 13. becauſe that declared him to be the only begotten Son of God, as St. *Paul* ſaith, *Rom.* 1. 4.

To which I might add, that by *the World to come*, Chriſt may very probably underſtand the time of the *New Teſtament*, which begun at Chriſts Death. The *Jews* (I hear) oft uſe this expreſſion of the days of the *Meſſiah.* Nay, the

* *In Loc. m.*

A ostle himself doth so, *Heb.* 2. 5 This also I have read, that the *Jews* did generally expect a more plentiful and glorious Remission of Sins at that time, and so Christs meaning may be this, That *this Blasphemy shall not be forgiven*, neither in that time nor state of the Church, (in which Christ then was) nor in the time of the Gospel and Kingdom of the *Messias*, which began at his Death (as I said) when, tho there should be many great Sins and Sinners pardoned, as we see there were, yet this should not. I hope you will not brag much of your Argument from this place, let me hear your other place.

Pop. *My second Argument is from* 1 Cor. 3. 15. He shall be saved, yet so as by Fire, *that is, the fire of Purgatory.*

Prot. It seems you understand this Fire properly, which is something strange, when the whole place is metaphorical, or figurative; *The Gold and Silver, Hay and Stubble*, all are metaphorical, and so doubtless is *the Fire.* I hear your *Bellarmin* confesseth that *the fire* mentioned, *v.* 13. *The fire shall try every mans works*, is not meant of Purgatory.

Pop. *He doth indeed say so.*

Prot. That is enough to overthrow this Argument; for it is most evident that the Fire, *ver.* 13, and 15, is one and the same. And this Fire cannot be Purgatory, 1. Because it is the Fire of the day of Judgment, when you confess Purgatory ends *. The time of the last Judgment is called the Day, by way of Eminency,

* *Bell. de Purg. l.* 2. *c.* 9. *Sect. Jam. vero.*

Heb.

*Heb.*10 25.2 *Tim* 1.12,18. *and* 4.8 *and* 1 *Thes* 5 4. And *the day of revelation and manifestation of all things*, because then all mens works will be manifested, and *the day wherein Christ will come in flaming Fire.* 2. This Fire burns the Works of Men, only their Hay and Stubble, not their Persons, as your Purgatory doth. 3. This Fire tries both good and bad. All pass through it. The *Gold* and *Silver* is in this Fire no less than the *Hay* and *Stubble.*

Pop. *How then, I pray you, do you understand this place?*

Prot. It is a Metaphor, or Figurative way of speaking, frequent in Scripture, and common use. The delivered *Jews* are said to be as *firebrands pluckt out of the burning*, *Am.*4.11. *Zech.* 3.2. So here, *He shall be saved so as by fire*; that is, not without difficulty and loss, and possibly some momentary shame; but howsoever the Fire shall burn up his work, and he shall lose that part of his reward. Now I have heard your Arguments, I hope you will hear mine.

Pop. *I am ready to do that.*

Prot. I shall urge only two.

First, Christ hath fully paid our debt, and satisfied Gods Justice for all our Offences; and therefore it were Injustice in God to require the payment of any part of that debt in Purgatory. Christ is a compleat Saviour; *His Blood cleanseth us from all sin*, 1 Joh. 1.7. *He is able* (and sure he is no less willing) *to save to the uttermost those that come to him*, Heb. 7.25. God *laid all our sins upon him*, Isa. 53. And he *bare them all in his Body*, 1 Pet.2.24. In short, either you make Christ but an half Saviour, and Be-

lievers wash away part of their own guilt; or if Christ hath fully washed away their guilt, you make God both unmerciful and unjust, and untrue too, so dreadfully to punish innocent Persons, and those too his own Children (as you acknowledg) whom he declares he hath freely and fully pardoned; and to do this for Sins, which you confess venial, and such as do not deserve the loss of Gods favour, and that without any necessity. This is not the Act of a Father, especially so tender a Father as God is.

Pop. *Christ is a sufficient Saviour, and hath fully satisfied; but satisfaction is applied to us by the pains of Purgatory.*

Prot. If Purgatory only applied Christs Satisfaction to us, then he satisfied for our *Temporal* as well as our Eternal Punishments; and if he did so, surely he did it fully, or not at all. Besides, you need not trouble your heads about the application; God hath provided for us more comfortable means of Application; on his part *the Word, Sacraments and Spirit*; on our parts, *Faith*. You may keep Purgatory for your own use, it is not fit you should be pestered with any Hereticks there. But was ever such an Application of Gods Grace heard of since the World began; that God should apply his Mercy, and the Grace of Christ Jesus, by such exquisite Torments? This is (as one truly saith) *As if a man should apply Physick by Poyson, or apply the Light of the Sun by putting out our Eyes.* God deliver us from such Appliers. This is as if a Prince should pretend a free pardon to a Malefactor, and apply it by putting him upon the Rack.

Pop.

Pop. *Tho Christ made Satisfaction for the guilt of mortal Sins, and eternal punishment, yet he did not for venial sins nor temporal punishment; and therefore they must purge out those themselves in Purgatory.*

Prot. If it were true that you say, yet there is no need of Purgatory; for this purging-work may be done by temporal Afflictions in this Life. The truth is you add Sin to Sin, and excuse one Error with another. But what do you mean by venial Sins?

Pop. *We mean such smaller Sins as do not exclude a man from Gods favour, nor from Heaven.*

Prot. Then surely you have very slight thoughts of Sin, of God, and of his Law, that can so judg of such an horrid evil as Sin. Scripture fully condemns this Doctrine. It tells me, that *the wages of Sin* (all Sin, without any difference) *is Death*, even that Death which is opposite to eternal Life, *Rom.* 6. 23. that, *He that shall break the least of Gods commands, and teach men so*), tho peradventure he do it ignorantly, and so according to your Opinion, it is a venial Sin) *shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven*; that is, he shall have no Portion there. It tells me, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the Book of the Law to do them*, Gal. 3. 10. And he speaks of that Curse which Christ underwent for us, and redeemed us from. It tells me, that *for every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of Judgment*, (*and by such words*, if not repented of, *they shall be condemned*) Mat. 12. 36, 37. So now your foundation, and one of the Pillars of Purgatory is

is gone. And as for your other fancy, that Christ did not satisfie for our temporal punishments, I pray you tell me, did not Christ suffer temporal afflictions.

Pop. *Yes doub less, the whole Gospel is full of such sufferings.*

Prot. Surely all that Christ suffered, he suffered for us, both in our stead, and for our good. He was cut off, *not for himself*, (but for our sins) *Dan* 1. 25 It was for our sakes that he bare the temporal part of the Curse, to *be hanged on a Tree*; and all that pain and shame was but a temporal punishment, *Gal* 3. 13. I read *Isa.* 53. that *Christ bore our griefs, and carried our sorrows, ver.* 4. which was not only accomplished in this, that he bare the guilt of our sins, as St. *Peter* expounds it, 1 *Pet.* 3. 24. but also in this, that he delivered them from sicknesses, and temporal afflictions, as St. *Matthew* expounds it, *Mat.* 8. 16, 17, and both these consist well together, since Christ removed both sin the cause, and affliction the effect of it.

Pop. *If Christ had satisfied for our Temporal punishments, then Believers should be free from all pains, and loss, and death, which it is apparent they are not, and therefore notwithstanding the fulness of Christs satisfaction, they may be liable to pains in Purgatory, as well as in this life.*

Prot. To this I answer three things.

First, Your inference from the pains of this life, to the torments of Purgatory, is weak and false: I may, and must believe, that God afflicts his people here, because Scripture and Experience put it out of doubt. But that God will punish his people in Purgatory after this life,

life, no Scripture affirms You that can multiply your instances of the sufferings of Believers in this life, and can tell us of *Adam*, and *David*, and *Solomon*, and many others, have not to this day been able (tho often urged) to produce one instance of the sufferings of any one Believer after this life (which one consideration is sufficient to overthrow this Argument in the Judgment of any indifferent man.

Secondly, There is not the same reason for the sufferings of Believers here, and those which you suppose in Purgatory; nor are they of the same nature. The present sufferings of Believers are necessary, (*1 Pet.* 1. 6. *You are in heavineſs if need be,*) both for Believers themselves to subdue the Flesh, which in this life is potent, and altogether needs such a curb. *By this ſhall the iniquity of Jocob be purged,* Isa. 27. 5. and to prevent their eternal Damnation, *1 Cor.* 12. 32 as also for the terrour and caution of other offenders. So that, albeit Christ hath fully paid the debt, yet it is upon other accounts convenient that they should smart and suffer here. But there is no such necessity nor use of Purgatory-sufferings, neither for Believers themselves (since there is no mortification of corruption after this life, no Temptations to sin there, no improvement of grace, no fear of eternal Damnation,) (*a*) nor for ex-

---

(*a*) *In Purgatorio animæ nec mereri nec peccare poſſunt*, Bel. de Purg. l. 2. cap. 2. *Animæ in Purgatorio certæ ſunt de ſua ſalute.* Bid. cap. 4.

ample

ample and warning to others. For their fellow-sufferers in Purgatory, you do not pretend they are at all edified by their sufferings; and men here, they neither see nor know any thing of these pains, nor hath God revealed any thing concerning them; but when God makes any examples to others, he sets them in the view of others, or at least acquaints them fully therewith, as he did with Hell-torments to this end. It were a senseless thing to hang up a man in *Jamaica*, for the terrour of those that live in *England*. Besides, the sufferings of Believers here do come from the love and faithfulness of God, *Heb.* 12. 6. *Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth.* Psal. 119. 75. *In faithfulness thou hast afflicted me.* Accordingly good men have looked upon them as choice mercies. *Psal.* 67. 12. *Blessed is the man whom thou chastnest.* And *Psal.* 119. 67. *It was good for me that I was afflicted.* And the denial of afflictions is threatned as a grievous punishment, *Isa.* 1. 5. *Hos.* 4. 14, 17.

But now the sufferings of Purgatory are in all points contrary; they are purely vindictive, and the effects of meer wrath; nor do you esteem those sufferings a mercy, and your happiness, but freedom from them. And therefore your Argument, from the pains of this life to those in Purgatory, is foolish and absurd.

Thirdly, Believers sufferings here do not at all derogate from the fulness of our Redemption by Christ, because (as I have shewed) admitting that to be compleat, yet they are necessary for other purposes. But your Purga-

tory

tory ſufferings do, by communicating at leaſt ſome part of his proper work to your ſelves. You profeſs they waſh away part of your ſins, which is Chriſts peculiar honour, *He waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood*, Rev. 1. 5. You make them a part of the Curſe of the Law, *from which* (and not only from a part of it) *Chriſt hath redeemed us, himſelf being made a curſe for us*, *Gal.* 3. 13. You make them a real ſatisfaction in part to Gods Juſtice (which is not ſatisfied by all that Chriſt did or ſuffered without them). And in a word, you make men in part their own Redeemers and Saviours. I hope by this you ſee how weakly you reaſon from preſent troubles, to Purgatory-torments; and that notwithſtanding your objection, my firſt Argument ſtands good againſt Purgatory.

My ſecond Argument is this: That the Scripture every where ſpeaks of the State of Believers immediately after death, as happy and bleſſed; and that all the ſufferings of Believers are confined to this life; and of this we have many expreſſions and examples too in Scripture, and not one to the contrary. *The ſufferings of this preſent time* (ſaith St. *Paul*) *are not worthy to be compared with the glory*, &c. Rom. 8. 18. He knew no other ſufferings: the afflictions of Believers are *light, and but for a moment*, and they too are in *things that are ſeen*, 2 Cor. 4. 17, 18. and therefore he knew of no ſufferings in the inviſible World, unleſs happily you will ſay that St. *Paul*'s Travels were in another road, into the third Heavens, and ſo he was ignorant of Purgatory. *Lazarus received his evil things in this life*, Luk. 16. 25. *But now he is comforted*; there-

therefore ſurely not in Purgatory. *If our earthly Houſe of this Tabernacle be diſſolved, we have an houſe in Heaven*, ſaith St. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 1. *We are no longer abſent from the Lord, than preſent in the Body*, ſaith St. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 6, 7, 8. The Prophet aſſures us, that when righteous men dye, *they enter into peace, they reſt in their beds*, Iſa. 57. 1, 2. I tell you, their beds are very hard, and the Prophets miſtake was very great, if they be frying in the flames of Purgatory. The *Beggar died*, (and it follows immediately) *he was carried by Angels into Abrahams boſom.* I cannot think theſe Angels miſtook their way: the Thief was to be with *Chriſt that day in Paradiſe*, Luke 23. 43.

Pop. *The Thief was a kind of Martyr, and ſo had that priviledg.*

Prot. His death was ſo far from being a Martyrdom, that it was a juſt puniſhment for his evil deeds, as he confeſſeth, *v.* 41. But becauſe ſome of your Martyrs (as you call them) were indeed Malefactors, therefore to ſalve their honour, you make this Malefactor a Martyr. I will give you but one place more of many, and that is, *Rev.* 14. 13 *Bleſſed are the dead that die in the Lord, from henceforth, that they may reſt from their labour.* A place ſo clear, that I am told, a famous Doctor of your own, and one of the *Sorbon*-Colledg, *Picherellus* by name, did ingenuouſly confeſs, St. *John* had in theſe few words put out the fire of Purgatory (*a*). And I am perſwaded you would have been aſhamed

(*a*) *De Miſſa.* p. 156.

to

to have kindled it again, but that by this craft you get all your living.

I think I need say no more to this point, let us now go to another. We have discoursed of Purgatory? Now if you please, let us discourse of the ways whereby you pretend to free men from it, which is by Absolutions, and Indulgences, and that which is necessary thereunto, to wit, Auricular Confession.

Pop. *It is well you mention that, for I assure you it is a matter of Salvation and Damnation; our Council of* Trent *hath determined, that* it is by Divine right necessary: *and as attrition alone (which is a grief for sin, arising only from a fear of Hell) will save a man where confession to a Priest follows; so all the repentance in the world will never save him* without this Confession *to a Priest*, viz. actual *where it may be had*; *or* in desire *when it cannot be actually had.*

Prot. Since you lay so much stress upon it, I expect suitable evidence for it. But first I pray you inform me, what your Doctrine is in this point.

Pop. *I will give you that in the words of the Council of* Trent *as near as I can*: *they say, That* every Christian is bound under pain of Damnation, to confess to a Priest all his mortal sins, which after diligent examination he can possibly remember; yea, even his most secret sins, his very thoughts, yea, and all the Circumstances of them which are of any moment [a].

Prot. Now let me hear your strongest Arguments to prove this.

[a] *Concil. Trident. sess.* 14. *de pœnitentia, cap* 4.

Pop.

Pop. *You ſhall. Our two great Arguments are theſe; Firſt, Prieſts are by God made Judges, and intruſted with power of the Keys for the Remiſſion of Sins; but no Judges can exerciſe Judicature, unleſs they know and underſtand the cauſe; and the Prieſt muſt know all the particular ſins, and their circumſtances by the mans own confeſſion, or elſe he knows not whether to bind or looſe him, to forgive or to condemn him. This is the Argument upon which the Council of* Trent *builds their Decree* [b]

Prot. Tell me I pray you, Is it neceſſary to Salvation, to confeſs every particular mortal ſin? What if a man unavoidably forget ſome of them?

Pop. *In that caſe we confeſs they may be pardoned without it, and it may ſuffice to ſay with David,* Cleanſe thy ſervant from ſecret ſins (*).

Prot. Now your Argument is quite loſt. For it ſeems in this caſe (which may be in many hundreds of ſins, eſpecially in a perſon of bad memory), your Judg can paſs ſentence without knowing the particular Cauſe, and therefore ſuch knowledg is not neceſſary to his giving Abſolution. Moreover, Tell me, I pray you, may not a Prieſt abſolve him from his ſins, whom Chriſt hath abſolved?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs.*

Prot. And is not every Prieſt bound to believe, that Chriſt hath abſolved every perſon that is truly penitent?

Pop. *There is no queſtion of that.*

Prot. Suppoſe a ſinner hath viſibly forſaken all his wicked ways and company, and lives a

[b] *Ibid* (*) *Ibid.*

very

very holy life before he comes to the Prieſt, and the Prieſt is certainly informed of this; Is not the Prieſt bound in that cauſe to believe he is truly penitent?

Pop. *I ſhould be moſt uncharitable if I ſhould deny that.*

Prot. Then he may without any more ado upon his deſire abſolve him, becauſe it appears that Chriſt hath abſolved him. It is not at all neceſſary to a Prieſt to this purpoſe to know whether a man be a greater or a leſs ſinner, ſince the grace of God is offered unto great as well as little ſinners; and therefore ſeeing this is your ſtrong Argument, and that learned Council could find no better, I ſee your cauſe is very low and bad; but I ſuppoſe you have ſome other Argument for it.

Pop. *There is ſo, and that is* Jam. 5. 16. Confeſs your faults one to another.

Prot. Is this your ſtrong Argument? here is not a word of the Prieſt, nor of Confeſſion to him, but only to our fellow Chriſtians; this confeſſion is mutual; and it will as well prove that the Prieſt is bound to confeſs his ſins to the people, as that the people are bound to confeſs to the Prieſt; the very next words are, *Pray one for another*; what, are we bound to pray only for the Prieſt? It is one thing that ſets me againſt your Religion, to conſider what pitiful arguments you rely upon; I am aſſured your own brethren confeſs the weakneſs of this argument, as *Vaſquez* [a], and *Cajetan* [b]

[a] *In* 3 *Thom. qu.* 90 *Art.* 1. *Sect. Omitimus.*
[b] *In locum.*

and

and *Canus* [c], but it seems you have no better: The weakness of your arguments for it, might save me the labour of mine against it; therefore I shall only offer to your thoughts these two considerations.

1. Your Doctrine makes that necessary to salvation, which God hath not made necessary. There is no command of God or Christ for it, as your eminent Doctors acknowledg, and it sufficiently appears from the vanity of your proofs for it; you confess it was not necessary in the old Testament, and yet there was as much need and use of it then as now; and Christ hath made the condition of his Church not more, but less burthensome than it was before. Many commands and exhortations to repentance there are in Scripture, not one which either commands this Auricular confession to a Priest, or declares the necessity of it; produce one place, and I yield; there are many instances of *John* the Baptist, and Christ and the Apostles, either actually giving, or in Gods Name proposing and offering remission of sins upon the conditions prescribed in the Gospel[a], among which, not one of them requires this Auricular confession. Bring one instance to the point, and I yield.

Pop. *I will give you two instances*, Matt. 3. 6. The Pharisees were baptized —— confessing

---

[c] *Relict. de Pœnit. par.* 6. * *Scotus & omnes decretorum interpretes inquit Maldon. in summa qu.* 18. *Art* 4. *Cajet. in Joh.* 20. 22. *Bell. de pœnit. l.* 1. *c.* 4. [a] Luke 18. 13. Mat. 9. 2. Act. 2. 38. & 3. 19 & 22. 16.

their

their ſins; and the Conjurers confeſſed their ſins, *Act.* 19. 18.

Prot. Theſe places do both ſpeak of publick Confeſſion, and in caſe of ſcandalous ſins (which we acknowledg to be a duty); but what is this to Auricular confeſſion? will you never ſpeak to the purpoſe? beſides, theſe places cannot be meant of Auricular confeſſion, for that was not then inſtituted, as your Council of *Trent* confeſſeth. Well, I ſee you can bring neither inſtance of this Confeſſion, nor precept for it, and therefore I am ſure there is no ſin in the neglect of it; for *where there is no law, there is no tranſgreſſion*, Rom. 4. 15.

2 Your Doctrin makes that inſufficient for pardon and ſalvation, which God makes ſufficient. The great God aſſureth us *That he that confeſſeth and forſaketh his ſins ſhall find mercy*, Prov. 28 13.

Pop. *That makes againſt you, for you ſee there is confeſſion required.*

Prot. And no doubt it is a mans duty to make confeſſion to God, and in caſe of wrong, unto men, and ſometimes to a Miniſter alſo, as in caſe of doubt or trouble of conſcience; but this is nothing to Auricular confeſſion, nor can the Text mean that, for you grant it was not as yet inſtituted. God declares, that *if the wicked forſake his (evil) way and thoughts, and turn unto God, he ſhall have mercy*, Iſa. 65. 7. So *Iſa.* 1. 16, 17, 18. ſo *Act.* 16. 31. St. *Paul* in Gods name promiſeth, *Believe on the Lord Jeſus and thou ſhalt be ſaved.* Thus *Rom.* 10. 13. *Whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved.* And who dares ſay that he that doth all theſe things ſhall not be ſaved, unleſs he confeſs

fess to a Priest, since God never spake such a word? What is it to add to Gods word, if this be not? The terms upon which Christ offered promised Salvation, are, *Repent and believe.*

Pop. *Auricular Confession is a part of Repentance.*

Prot. When Christ preached that Doctrine, it was no part of Repentance, for you confess it was not then instituted; your Council of *Trent* determines, that it was instituted by Christ after his Resurrection *. And you will find it hard to perswade any rational man, that Repentance wanted a necessary part before Christ's Resurrection, or that it was of one kind before it, and quite another after it. But I will not wast more time about so vain a fancy; for my part, I rest upon Christs gracious promises to repenting and believing sinners: By Gods grace I will endeavour to do these things, and I doubt not but he will make good his word whether you will or no; let God be true, and every man a lyar.

But possibly you have better Arguments for *Absolutions and Indulgences:* Produce them; but first let me hear what your Doctrine in this point is.

Pop. *I will give you this in brief, together with the rise and ground of it We believe,* First, That there are divers Saints who not only merit for themselves, but a great deal to spare, and all their merits are put into one Treasury. Secondly, That these merits are appliable to others, so as God will pardon *Thomas,* for example,

* *De Pœnitentia.*

ample, for *John*'s merit. Thirdly, That God hath put this treaſure into the Churches, that is, the Popes hands, and from him unto the hands of all Prieſts, who have a power to apply theſe merits as they ſee fit.

Prot. There is nothing ſound and ſolid in this whole diſcourſe: Firſt, I have proved that there is no Purgatory, there is your foundation of Indulgences gone; next, I hope e're we part, to ſhew, that there is no ſuch thing as merit in good Works, which is another of your foundations. Next, That *any mans merits* (except Chriſts) may be applied to another, I pray you inform me, for I have learned quite otherwiſe: I read that *every one ſhall bear his own burden*, Gal. 6 6. *Every one ſhall receive according to what* H E *hath done in his body*, 2 Cor. 5. 10. The wiſe Virgins differed from you, they thought they had Oyl little enough for themſelves, and none at all to ſpare, *Mat.* 25. 9. So if you are Virgins, it ſeems you are none of that ſort. If you can prove this conceit of yours, do.

Pop. *I will give you a clear place*, Col. 1. 24. *St.* Paul *ſaith*, I now rejoyce in my ſufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind, or that which is lacking of the afflictions of Chriſt in my fleſh, for his Bodies ſake, which is the Church.

Prot. Firſt tell me, do you think any thing was lacking or defective in Chriſt's ſufferings?

Pop. *No, You uſe to charge us with that opinion, but falſly.*

Prot. It is well you grant thus much; but if you denied it, a cloud of plain Scriptures would

would force you to grant it us, which tells, that *by one offering Christ perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, Heb. 10 14. And that *he is able to save to the uttermost*, Heb. 7.25. By *sufferings of Christ*, then, we must understand the sufferings of Christ mystical, or Christ in his members, which are usually so called (*a*); when Christ had done suffering in his person, he left it as a legacy to his members that they should suffer with him, and for him (*b*), and St. *Paul* bore his share in these sufferings; and for the last clause of his *suffering for the Church*, this phrase, it is true, is ambiguous, *and sometimes indeed it signifies to satisfie Gods justice for another*, but in this sence St *Paul* rejects it with indignation, 1 *Cor.* 1. 13 *Was Paul crucified for you*, but it is not always thus taken for St. *Paul* saith he suffered for *Christ*, 2 *Cor.* 12. 10 not surely to satisfie for him: There is therefore another sence; and that is, he suffered for the Churches Edification and Establishment, and so indeed he elsewhere explains himself, *Phil.* 1. 12. and I am told, that your own Brethren understand it thus (*c*), and your *Bellarmin* confesseth the words may be thus expounded, but only saith, *the words may conveniently receive this sense* ||: which is as much as to say, if you will be courteous, you may grant him the Argument; but if you do not, he cannot prove it. But admit there be such a treasury of Merits for others as you pretended, how prove you that your Priests

(*a*) *Acts* 9. 4. 2 *Cor.* 1. 7. *Heb.* 11. 27. (*b*) *Act* 9. 16 & 14. 22. 2 *Tim* 3. 2. (*c*) *Tho Est. Justin. in locum.* || *De pœnit. l.* 3. *c.* 3.

are made Judges, and inveſted with ſuch a power of diſtributing thoſe Merits, and giving Abſolutions as you challenge?

Pop. *Our great Argument is, John* 20. 23. Whoſoever's Sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whoſoever's Sins ye retain, they are retained.-*Anſwer me this Argument, and I will yield up this cauſe.*

Prot. What Argument do you draw from theſe words?

Pop. *Hence it appears, that* Miniſters *are made Judges, and intruſted with full Power and Authority of binding and looſing, ſo as* Chriſt doth not looſe *(or forgive)* a Sinner by himſelf, but only by the Prieſt, *as* Bellarmin *ſaith* *. *And to ſpeak properly, as our moſt learned* Vaſquez *affirmeth,* God doth not properly looſe a Sinner, but only approves of the Prieſts looſing of him.

Prot. Now in my Opinion, it were good Manners to make the Prieſt come after God; and not to make God depend upon the Prieſt. It ſeems then, if the Prieſt ſhould grow ſurly or envious, and deny me a pardon, Chriſt cannot help me, for he hath given the Power out of his hands: So you make the Prieſt the Judg, and God only the Approver. The Lord rebuke this Spirit of Blaſphemy. Again, nothing is more familiar in Scripture, than for Gods Miniſters to be ſaid to do that, which they do only Authoritatively declare that God will do. Thus God ſaith to *Jeremy, I have ſet thee over Kingdoms, to root out, and pull down, and deſtroy;*

* *In* 3. *partem Thomæ. qu.* 8. *art.* 3.

that is, by declaring that God would do it. In like manner, Gods Ministers are said to bind and loose, because they have from God authority to declare a Sinner to be bound by his Sin or loosed from them, which (if they declare truly and according to Gods word) God in Heaven doth and will make it good. As for the Text, it saith nothing but this, That every one whom they bind or loose, that is, proceeding according to their rule (which is always to be understood) shall be bound or loosed in Heaven; but it doth not say, that no man is bound or loosed, but they whom the Priest bindeth and looseth.

But besides, if all these things were granted. How doth this Text prove, that the Priest or Pope can absolve or release any Souls out of Purgatory, if there were such a place? I pray you tell me, Can the Pope bind any Soul, and keep him in Purgatory?

Pop. *No, we do not pretend to that.*

Prot. Then he cannot loose a Soul neither out of Purgatory; for I am sure binding and loosing are of the same Extent. But upon second thoughts, I must own your Discretion; for the binding of Souls in Purgatory was an invidious and unprofitable Work, and would have bound up mens hearts and purses: It is only the loosing of them out, which opens their Purse-strings, and tends to the Edification of the Church, that is the Pope and Priests (as they always understand that word). In sober sadness, it is enough to make any serious Christian abhor your Church, that your Pope should not be content to usurp a Power over the whole visible

visible World, but that he should extend his Authority to the other World, even to Purgatory. In my opinion he had done more wisely to have extended his Empire to Hell, for there are many of his Predecessors (so far as can be judged by any mans Life) whom he might have appointed his Deputies; but there is never a Pope in Purgatory; for they who can release others at Pleasure, will certainly deliver themselves: But now I speak of that, I pray you tell me if it be true that I have heard, That the Pope when he dies, receives Absolution from his Confessor; and that after his Death the Cardinals give him Absolution, and give order for the singing of abundance of Masses?

Pop. *It is true, I was at* Rome *when the last Pope died, and it was so then, and our Books justifie it.*

Prot. I am much pleased with your Ingenuity; so the Pope gives the Priest a Power to Pardon himself. methinks he might save the charges of a Confessor; It were enough to say, *I absolve my self.* But tell me, Do you say Masses for any that are in Heaven, or in Hell?

Pop. *No, we utterly disclaim that.*

Prot. Then I perceive the Pope goes into Purgatory, I see your Popes are not self-seeking Men (as they are slandered to be) that help so many thousand out of Purgatory, and leave themselves in.

But really, this is to me a convincing Argument, that you do not believe your selves, but deceive poor silly People against your Consciences, for else you might be assured, the Pope

would never come into Purgatory; for you say he can keep himself out, and no man doubts of his will to do it. Besides, your Doctrine usurps upon Gods Prerogative; I had thought it was only my Father in Heaven to whom I should have prayed, *Forgive us our Trespasses*: Now, it seems, we must pray so to one of these Padre's upon Earth. You make Subjects the Supreme Judges of all Offences committed against their Soveraign, and your *Priests* sit as Umpires between God and the Sinner, and determine what Satisfaction God shall have, and what Penance the Sinner shall undergo. Methinks they are brave Fellows; and now I see it was not without ground, that Father *Cotton* bragged, that he *could do any thing when he had his God in his hand*, (that was the Sacrament) *and his King upon his knees* (in Confession). I think you will bring Christ upon his Knees too, for it seems you have resolved, that he shall stand to your Priests Arbitration.

I might add to this, That you leave the Souls of People in endless Perplexities; you confess, that Indulgences profit not, *If a man be not in the state of Grace* *, (which you say a man cannot certainly know) or *if a man have not made a true and full Confession after sufficient examination* ||, (and who knows when he hath done these things sufficiently?) or *if the Priest do not intend to pardon him*, (and who knows another man's Intentions?) and yet you would have me so desperate, to venture my Soul upon such

* *Bell. de Indulg. lib.* 1. *cap.* 13. || *Concil. Trident. de Pœnitentia.*

sandy

ſandy foundations, that your ſelves are afraid and aſhamed of. But to leave this, I perceive that this, and divers of your other Doctrines are grounded upon that of the Merit of good Works, which becauſe I judg a very pernicious and dangerous Doctrine, let me hear what you can ſay for it; but firſt, let me underſtand your Doctrine; for I have heard ſome of you cry out, that our Divines ſlandered them, and profeſs that they did not hold Merit ſtrictly, but caſt the honour of all upon Chriſt, and the Grace of God; therefore I pray you inform me.

Pop. *I will be plain and candid with you; I do not like ſuch Artifices, The Council of* Trent *in plain terms affirms,* That our good works do truly Merit increaſe of grace and eternal life *(a)*; *and our famous* Bellarmine *diſputes and proves, That* good works do not only Merit in reſpect of Gods gracious Covenant, but in regard of the worthineſs of the works themſelves; *and* that eternal life is not only due from Gods liberality, but from his juſt Judgment *(b)*.

Prot. I pray you tell me, Hath *Bellarmine* ſuch expreſſions as theſe, That *becauſe God would honour his Children, he would have them to get Heaven by their merits, which is more Honourable to them, than to receive it by Gods free gift?*

Pop Bellarmine *doth ſay ſo* (c).

Prot. I ſee he was a man of a brave ſpirit, and much a Gentleman: but in my poor opinion, he ſhould have taken a little care for the ho-

(a) *Cap.* 11. *can.* 32. (b) *De Juſtificat. lib* 5. *cap.* 16, & 17. (c) *De Juſtif. lib.* 5. *cap.* 3.

nour of God, as well as of the Saints: But I have heard of many ſtrange expreſſions aſcribed to your Authors; I hear your *Tapperus* ſaith, *Far be it from them, that righteous men ſhould expect eternal life, as a beggar doth an Alms. It is much more glorious, that they ſhould receive it as Conquerors and Triumphers, and poſſeſs it as a reward due to their labours* (d) I ſee alſo this was a man of honour. And again, That *our good works deſerve the reward from God, as from a juſt Judg, and are able to abide the ſevere judgment of God, though he weigh all circumſtances* (e). I am told that your renowned *Vaſquez* ſaith, That *Eternal life is due to the works of good men, without any Covenant, or the favour of God* (ſ) And your learned *Cajetan* and *Dominicus a Scoto* ſay as much, as I hear *Bellarmine* reports (g). And that *Vaſquez* again ſaith, *The merits or perſon of Chriſt, adds no worth to the works of good men* (h). This man was reſolved ſo far to tread in *Abraham's* ſteps; as *Abraham* would not receive from the King of *Sodom*, ſo he would not receive from Chriſt, from a thread to a ſhoe-latchet, leſt it ſhould be ſaid Chriſt had made him rich. Are theſe things true?

Pop. *It is ſo.*

Prot. Then ſure I am, our Religion is the ſafeſt way; if we do err, it is in giving too much to God; but if you err, it is no leſs than the worſt kind of Sacriledg, to rob God of ſo much of his glory, and the honour of your ſalvation.

(d) *In Explic. Artic. Lovan. Tom.* 2. *Art.* 9.
(e) *Ibid. Art* 8. (f) *In* 1 *ſecundæ Tom.* 2. *diſ.* 214.
(g) *De Juſtif. l.* 5. *c.* 17. (h) *Ubi ſupra.*

Yet

Yet, if you can prove this, I will receive it. Produce your ſtrongeſt Arguments.

Pop. *Firſt then, I prove it hence, That* Eternal life is called a reward, *Mat.* 5. 12. And given to Labourers in the Vineyard, *Mat.* 20.

Prot. We muſt compare Scripture with Scripture; other places tell us, *It is an Inheritance, Gal.* 4. 7. *Rom.* 8. 17. The ſame Eſtate cannot be mine both by inheritance and purchaſe.

Pop. *Yes it may, I will prove it by an inſtance, The glory which Chriſt had, was his by inheritance (for he was heir of all things) and yet by purchaſe,* Phil. 2. 8, 9.

Prot. I thank you for this Objection, I have ſcarce had any thing from you like a ſolid Argument but this; it deſerves an Anſwer. Firſt then, this will not reach our caſe: The great hinderance of merit in our works, is, that the beſt of them are imperfect, and a debt we owe to God before-hand; but Chriſts works are of another kind, they are compleat and perfect, and in part no debt; for though when Chriſt was made Man, he was a debtor to God, and bound as a Creature to fulfil the Law; yet this was a voluntary act, and no debt to God, that he would become Man, and ſo put himſelf under the Law. Beſides, the dignity of his perſon made his works proportionable unto all the glory he received: whereas *all our ſufferings are not worthy to be compared with our glory,* Ro. 8. 18. Secondly, It might be both an Inheritance and Purchaſe in Chriſt in divers reſpects, becauſe he had two natures; as he was God, or the Son of God, it was his Inheritance, and belonged to his Manhood only as united with the

Godhead; as he was Man, he might purchase it, by what he did and suffered in the flesh: But in us there are not two natures, nor any of these pretences to merit. Moreover, Scripture speaks of two kinds of Rewards, the one of Grace, the other of Debt; and withal affirms, That the reward which God gives to good men, is meerly of Grace (as we profess) and not of Debt (as you pretend), *Rom.* 4.4.

Pop. *Possibly it may be of both, as* Bellarmine *saith* (i).

Prot. No, the Apostle forbids that, *Rom.* 11. 6. *If by grace, it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more grace, otherwise work is no more work*; and this *reward is not given to him that worketh, but believeth*, Rom 4.5. No Protestant could speak our Doctrine more fully.

Pop. *But God gives this reward to men for working in his Vineyard*, Mat. 20.

Prot. It is true, but still the reward appears to be of grace, because it is alike to him that came at the last hour, as to them that had born the heat and burden of the day, *vers.* 12. but that Heaven is a reward of justice, and a due debt (as you profess) this Text proves not, and other Scriptures plainly contradict.

Pop. *But God is said to reward men* according to their works, *that is, according to the proportion of them, and that implies merit.*

Prot. Not so neither; for since *God is pleased* to *reward in us his own gifts and graces, not our merits*, as St. *Bernard* speaks, he may still keep

(i) *Lib.* 5. *Cap* 17.

the

the proportion, and to them to whom he gives more grace here, he may give more glory hereafter; and yet there is no more merit in this additional reward, than in the reſt. Again, I may as well conclude the blind men merited their ſight, becauſe Chriſt ſaith, *Be it unto you according to your faith*, Matth. 9. 29. as you gather merit from this phraſe, *according to your works*; therefore let me hear if you have any other Argument.

Pop. *Our works are mentioned as the cauſes for which God gives eternal life*, Mat. 25. Come ye bleſſed, for I was hungry, and ye fed me; *and other like places.*

Prot. St. *Paul* did not think this a good Argument; for, tho he knew that it was ſaid of *Abraham*; *becauſe thou haſt done this, I will bleſs thee*, Gen. 22. 16, 17. yet he poſitively denies the merit of *Abraham's* works, *Rom.* 4 & *Gal.* 3. And he ſaith of himſelf, *I obtained mercy, becauſe I did it ignorantly*, 1 Tim. 1. 13. yet I hope you do not think his ignorance merited mercy. The King ſaith, *I forgave thee all that debt, becauſe thou deſiredſt me*, Mat. 18. 32. Did his asking deſerve it? Beſides all this, if God did reward them for their good works, this will not prove merit; if God reward men infinitely more than their good works deſerve (as God indeed doth) and *Bellarmin* acknowledgeth ſo much *.

Pop. *But good men are ſaid to be worthy*, Rev. 3. 4.

Prot. They are ſo comparatively to other men, and alſo by Gods gracious acceptation in and through Chriſt; but otherwiſe, the holyeſt Saints of God have ever judged themſelves unworthy of the leaſt of Gods mercies ſo far

were they from thinking they were worthy of eternal life.) *Gen.* 32. 10. *Matth.* 8. 8 And since it is Gods grace which gives them all their worth and meetnes for Heaven, *Colos.* 1. 12. it is impudence to pretend to merit from God by it. If yet you will boast of your own worth and merit, answer the Apostles question at your leisure, 1 *Cor* 4. 7. *For who maketh thee to differ from another? And what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?* If you can baffle your Conscience now, you will find it a hard question to answer at the last day.

Pop. *But eternal life is given them by Gods Justice,* 2 Thes. 4 6. 1 Tim. 4 7, 8.

Prot. This word also doth not prove any merit, for Gods Justice is oft times taken improperly; I read, 1 *John* 1. 9. *If we confess our sins, he is just and faithful to forgive them*; yet justification is not merited, as you confess, but is an act of meer grace, *being justified freely by his grace,* &c. *Rom.* 3. 24, 28. Thus 2 *Pet.* 1. 1. we are said to *obtain precious faith through the righteousnes of God*; and yet faith is the gift of God, and you confess that is given without merit, (for you grant none but justified persons can merit); therefore in such places, Justice is taken either for equity, and the congruity of it with Gods nature or words, or for the faithfulnes of God, or the like.

Pop. *Since you despise my Arguments, let me hear if you have better against the merit of good works.*

Prot. You shall, and methinks that one place, *Luk.* 17. 10. should convince you, *When ye shall have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable Servants; we have done*

that which was our duty to do.

Pop. *Christ doth not affirm they are unprofitable, but only bids them say they are unprofitable, and teaches them to be humble (a)*

Prot. Very well; then you think Christ taught them to think one thing, and say another; that is, he taught them the art of lying, and that to God.

Pop. *I answer further, That without Gods grace, men are unprofitable; they only can merit that are in the state of grace, as our Church holds.*

Prot. Doth not your Conscience tell you, the Apostles, whom Christ commands to say thus, were in the state of Grace?

Pop. *Tho a man cannot profit God, he may profit himself.*

Prot. If he cannot profit God, he cannot properly merit any thing from God; for that implies a proportion between giving and receiving.

Pop. *It is true, we are unprofitable by our selves in regard of Gods absolute Soveraignty; but not unprofitable, in regard of Gods gracious Covenant.*

Prot. It is ridiculous to say that is merit properly which depends on Gods meer grace; and besides, the *Pharisees* themselves, whose error Christ there strikes at, were never so vain or absurd, to think they could be profitable to God in any other sense than what you affirm.

Pop. *Let me hear your other Argument.*

Prot. The nature of merit shews the impossibility of it in men; It is evident that to merit, these amongst other ingredients, are required

(a) *Bell. de Justif. l. 5. c. 5. secta quart.*

First,

First, That the work be not due already: Doth any man deserve an Estate for that money whereby he pays on old debt?

Secondly, That the work be our own: You do not think a Noble man's Almoner merits by distributing his Masters Alms.

Thirdly, That it be profitable to him of whom he merits.

Fourthly, That the work be perfect; for that action which needs a pardon, certainly cannot deserve a reward.

Fifthly, That it be suitable to the reward: if I present my Prince with a horse, and he requite me with a Lordship, who but a Horse would pretend this was merited?

Pop. *I must acknowledg most of those things are true, but this doth not concern our works.*

Prot. That we will now examine: And first, all the works now we can do for God, are deserved by him: It fills me with horrour, to hear men pretending to merit of that God who (as they profess) created them, and every day upholds their Souls in life, and redeemed them, and is so infinitely before-hand with them every way: Tell me, Dare you say that God doth not deserve that you should do the utmost you can for his service and glory?

Pop. *I will not say so.*

Prot. Then it is impudence to pretend merit from God; besides, the good works we do, are not properly our own, but Gods; *Faith is the gift of God*, Eph. 2. 8 Phil. 1. 22. So is *Repentance*, Acts 11. 18. & 5. 31. And in general, *Every good and perfect gift is from God*, Jam. 1. 17.

Pop. *The first grace is from God; but that I use it aright, that is from my self, and thereby it is that I merit.*

Prot. St. *Paul* was not of your mind; What good work is there, but it lies either in willing or doing? yet both these *God works in us*, Phil. 2 13. not only the power of believing, but the act too (and suffering also) is *the gift of God*, Phil. 1. 29. And St. *Paul*'s abundant labours in the Gospel, which certainly amounted to merit, if there were ever such a thing in the World, and which, if any thing was his own act, yet he dare not take to himself; *I laboured, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me*, 1 Cor. 15. 10. No less evident is it, that our works cannot profit God, *Psal.* 16. 4. *Job* 22. 3. & 35. 7. As also our best works are so far from meriting, that they need a pardon from the infirmities accompanying them, by reason of which the best of Saints have been afraid of the severe Judgments of God even upon their best works; so was *Job*, (a) and *David* (b), and *Paul* (c) And lastly it is so evident that our Works are not proportionable to the Reward, that *Bellarmin* hath a Chapter upon this Head, to prove that *good works are rewarded above their desert* (d); and therefore it is an intolerable arrogance to affirm, That divers of the Saints have not only merit enough to purchase eternal Life, but a great deal to spare for the relief of others.

To let this point pass, now I would willingly be informed of two things which concern us Lay-people in an especial manner.

First, Why you defraud us of the Cup?

Secondly, Why you order Prayer to be

(a) *Job* 9. 2. (b) *Psal.* 130. 3. (c) 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. (d) *De Justificatione, l.* 1. *c.* 19.

made in a Language that many, nay, moſt of us do not underſtand: For the firſt, you rob us of one half of the Sacrament: *viz.* of the Cup; what can you ſay to acquit your ſelves from Sacriledg?

Pop. *Let me hear what right you have to it.*

Prot. Firſt, I remember you diſputed for Tranſubſtantiation out of *John* 6. which you ſaid, ſpoke of the Sacrament; now if you ſay true, there is a paſſage in it, ver. 53. *Except you eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you.* If this be ſpoken of the Sacrament (as you ſay it is) and the Wine really his blood, then you do no leſs than murder all your people, by robbing them of that which is neceſſary to their life.

Pop. *Not ſo, for (as I ſhall ſhew you) you have the blood in the Body (or bread).*

Prot. If it be ſo, yet my taking it in that manner, cannot be called a drinking it, unleſs you will ſay that every man that eats rawiſh meat, may be ſaid to drink the blood which he eats in it, but further, I think we have as great right to the Cup, as your Prieſts; we have Chriſts *Do this*, and you pretend no more: In ſhort, we have both the Legacy and Command of Chriſt fortified with this ſtrong reaſon, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſins*; whereby it ſufficiently appears that the ſign belongs to all that have intereſt in the thing, and are capable of diſcerning the Lords Body; and this command of Chriſt is expreſs and poſitive, *Mat.* 26. *Drink ye ALL of it*; it is remarkable that he doth not ſay, Eat ye all, (though they were to do ſo) but Drink ye *all* of it, as afore

ſeeing the Sacriledg of your Church; what can you ſay to this?

Pop. *Firſt, I ſay, here is no Command, but an Inſtitution only.*

Prot. I underſtand no ſubtilties; but if you ſay, this was no cammand of drinking, then it was no command of eating, to ſay, *Take, eat,* and ſo the Sacrament is not commanded; but people may receive or refuſe it as they pleaſe, and Chriſts *Do this,* is no more than *Do as you liſt*; for my part, I ſhall never know when Chriſt commands any thing, if this be not a command, for no command can run in more expreſs words.

Pop. *If this be a command, it concerns only* Prieſts, *for ſuch the Apoſtles were, and they only were preſent.*

Prot. Since it is evident, that eating and drinking belong to the ſame perſons; if the one be reſtrained to the Apoſtles, ſo is the other; and becauſe you confeſs the eating belongs to the people by virtue of this precept, [*Eat of it,*] by the ſame reaſon doth alſo the drinking reach to them alſo by virtue of that precept, [*Drink of it.*]Beſides, the Apoſtles, though they were *Miniſters,* yet in this act they were in *the peoples* ſtead, and Chriſt was the *Miniſter* or diſpenſer of the Sacrament, and they only the *Receivers* of it at this *time.*

Beſides, as they were *Miniſters,* he bad them *do this*; that is, take and diſtribute Bread and Wine to the people, as he had to them; If *Miniſters* be under any command of adminiſtring and giving the Sacrament, certainly it is here, (for no command can be more expreſs) and

and if they are commanded to give the Bread to the people, they are commanded to give the Wine alſo, for here is no difference at all.

Add to this, that St. *Paul* hath put this out of doubt, and he expounds this of, and applies it to the people; for thus he writes to all the *Corinthians, Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup,* 1 Cor. 11. 28. in four *verſes* together, *viz.* 26, 27, 28, 29. eating and drinking are inſeperably joyned together, which you have ſo wickedly divided; If it be a Command, *Let a man examine himſelf* (which none will deny), then it is a Command (which immediately follows) *So let him eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup.*

Pop *It doth not appear that there is an abſolute command of drinking, but only that as oft as they do drink it, they ſhould drink it in remembrance of Chriſt.*

Prot. If this be ſo, then here is no command for the Prieſt either to conſecrate the Cup, or receive it. And further, then here is no command for his Conſecrating or receiving the Bread neither; for there is no more than a *Do this*, and that is for the Wine as well as for the Bread.

Pop. *Here is a differnce, for he ſaith of the Body ſimply*, Do this in remembrance of me; *but of the Cup*, This do ye as oft as ye drink it.

Prot. If ye lay any ſtreſs upon theſe words, *As oft as ye do it*, I beſeech you make uſe of your eyes, and you ſhall read it is ſaid of the *Bread*, as well as of the *Cup*, Ver. 26. *For as oft as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup.* Well, I am ſorry to ſee that you dare oppoſe ſuch plain Scripture, upon ſuch pitiful pretences. But I

pray you let me ask you, I have been told that your famous Council of *Conſtance*, in their Canon for the receiving the Sacrament in one kind, have theſe expreſſions; *Although Chriſt did miniſter this Sacrament under the forms of Bread & Wine--And although in the Primitive Church this Sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds.*——Yet they make a Canon, that it ſhall be received under one kind only. Is this ſo?

P. *It is true, they are the very words of the Council.*

Prot. This was a wiſe Council indeed, wiſer than Chriſt and all his Apoſtles! but I ſhould think we are on the ſafeſt ſide, having Chriſt and all the Primitive Churches for our patterns: and by this I ſee what to judg of your glorious pretences, that yours is the ancient and Apoſtolical Faith, and ours (forſooth) but a new Religion. But I pray let me hear what you have to ſay for this fact of yours in taking away the Cup? I ſee Scripture is againſt you, and the ancient Church, at leaſt ſo far, that for 1400 years together the people might drink of the Cup (if they would) as I am told your *Becanus* confeſſeth *.

Pop. *You are greatly miſtaken, we have Scripture for us, we have examples there of receiving the Sacrament in one kind*, Act 2.42. They continued in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and in breaking of Bread: and *Act.* 20 17. they came together to break Bread.

Prot. It is uſual to expreſs an whole Feaſt by this one thing, *Chriſt went into the* Phariſees *houſe to eat bread*, Luk. 4 2 I ſuppoſe you think it was not a dry Feaſt. *Joſeph's* Brethren *ſate*

* *In manuali de communione ſub utraque ſpecie.*

to

to eat, Gen. 37. 25. so *Act.* 27. 25. *Paul* (and the rest) *took Bread and eat it*, yet none doubts but they had drink with it. Besides, here is as much said of the *People*, as of the *Ministers* drinking of the Cup; that is, neither is here mentioned; and if the silence concerning the Cup be a good Argument, it proves, that neither did partake of it: if it be not, then both might partake of it: But what have you more to say?

Pop. *You need not be troubled so much at the loss of the Cup, since the blood is contained in the Bread, that is, in the Body, by concomitancy.*

Prot. This is in effect to tell Christ, the Cup was a superfluous device: Besides, we are commanded to drink the Cup. If I should dip bread in drink, and eat it, no man will say I drink the bread. Again, this destroys the main end of the Sacrament, which is to shew forth Christs death, and the shedding of his blood; and this was the reason why Christ appointed the Bread and Wine apart, as the fittest means to bring to our memories the pouring of his Blood out of his body for us; and as God would have us to remember the thing, so he commanded us to use this sign of drinking the Cup.

Pop. *But there are many weighty Reasons why it is not fit you should partake of the Cup.*

Prot. I dare not forsake plain Scripture for any subtil pretences of Humane Reason; but let me hear them.

Pop. 1. *In some Countries Wine is not to be had.* 2. *Some there are who have an antipathy against Wine, and cannot drink any.* 3. *There is a great*

danger

danger of ſpilling the Wine, which is the blood of Chriſt.

Prot. Are theſe your weighty Reaſons? I ſee the Reaſon and Religion of *Rome* are both of a Complexion. But I pray you how came it to paſs, That Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and all the Primitive Chriſtians, for ſo many hundreds of years ſhould preſcribe and uſe the Cup, notwithſtanding thoſe Reaſons? ſurely if theſe Reaſons are ſtrong now, they were ſo One thouſand ſix hundred and ſixty years ago: Wine was as ſcarce then (as now it is) in ſome Countries; abſtenious perſons were then as well as now; the Wine might be ſpilled then as much as now. But they feared none of theſe things; either they were all ſtupid, that did not ſee theſe things, or your Church is audacious, that dare in effect teach Chriſt and his Apoſtles what they ſhould have done. It might peradventure be added, that in ſuch places where Wine cannot be had, or for ſome perſons who cannot drink Wine, ſome other thing proportionable to it may be allowed; but if it might not, or if in ſuch ſpecial Caſes they were confined to one kind, I am ſure it is a ridiculous Conſequence, that becauſe they muſt be content with the Bread that cannot drink of the Cup, therefore they that can, ſhall go wi hout it; and becauſe it may be omitted where it cannot be had, therefore it ſhall be omitted where it may be enjoyed. And for the danger of ſpilling of the Wine, there is alſo danger in dropping ſome of the Bread, and ſo that ſhould be denied: By this Argument alſo, the Prieſt ſhould not meddle with the Wine, for he may ſpill it; but indeed

deed ſuch phantaſtical Reaſons as theſe deſerve no Anſwer; they make me almoſt ſick to hear them.

There is only one point more, I would be informed in, what you can pretend for it, and that is, That your publick prayers are performed in a Language unknown to moſt of your people.

Pop. *What have you to ſay againſt it?*

Prot. What can be ſaid more plainly and fully againſt it by us, than what St. *Paul* ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 14. there I find ſome, who having the Gift of ſpeaking with divers languages, did uſe it without interpreting them in publick Aſſemblies; thoſe the Apoſtle informs, that there is a better gift, and more deſirable than that of Tongues, namely Prophecy; and he uſeth divers Reaſons, which are as ſo many undeniable Arguments againſt your *Latin* Prayers: He tells them it is their duty to manage publick Worſhip, ſo as the Church may be edified, *Verſ* 4,5,12. I hope you will not deny this.

Pop. *None can deny that.*

Prot. Well; then he tells us, that what is ſpoken in an unknown Language doth not edifie the Church, *verſ.* 4, 11, 12, 14. 2. Yet again, the Apoſtle commands that if any do ſpeak in an unknown Tongue, it muſt be interpreted, *verſ* 27 you diſobey this command. 3. He argues, that publick Prayers are ſo to be made by the Miniſter, that the people may ſay, *Amen*, *verſ.* 16. And he alſo tells us, that no man can ſay *Amen* to that which he doth not underſtand, *ver.* 15. ſo the Apoſtle ſtops all your ſtarting holes.

Pop.

Pop. *The very word* Amen, *is* Hebrew.

Prot. You diſpute not only againſt me, but againſt the Apoſtle himſelf; but *Amen*, tho an *Hebrew* word, is by common uſe ſufficiently known to us all, to expreſs our conſent to his Prayers, and Confidence that God will hear them. 4. Yet again, he urges, that ſtrange Tongues are deſigned only for the Conviction of Unbelievers, not to be uſed by Believers amongſt themſelves, unleſs interpreted, *v.* 22. What can, or dare you ſay againſt ſuch clear places?

Pop. *St.* Paul *ſpeaks not of the ordinary Service of the Church, but of extraordinary Hymns and Songs.*

Prot. That is falſe; he ſpeaks of the ordinary Service of the Church, tho at that time there was ſomething extraordinary in it; and beſides, his Reaſons reach to all times and ſervices, ordinary and extraordinary; muſt we not look to the Edification of the Church in the one as well as the other? Muſt not the People ſay *Amen* in one as well as the other? Let me hear therefore what you have to ſay for your ſelves.

Pop. *Preaching ought to be in a known Language, for the end of that is the Peoples Edification; but Prayers are made to God.*

Prot. Tho they are made to God, yet they are made by the Church, who are to joyn in thoſe Prayers, and to ſignifie their Conſent, by ſaying *Amen*, which requires their underſtanding: And moreover, that Chapter ſpeaks as expreſly of *Praying*, as it doth of *Propheſying* in the Church. Surely the People went

went not to Church to sit there like senseless Images, but to offer up a reasonable Service, and to render their *Prayers* and *Praises* unto God by the mouth of the Minister, as they did *Act.* 4. 24. *They lift up their voice with one accord.* And if we pray with you, we must understand; else we cannot Pray in Faith (as it is our Duty to do) and we shall fall into their error, to ask we know not what.

Pop. *You need not concern your self about that; you may rely upon the wisdom and fidelity of the Church, who takes care that your Prayers be right.*

Prot. I confess there is this great encouragement for it, that your Church it seems is wiser than St. *Paul*; but as a friend I advise you to give this Counsel of relying upon your Church to the *Indians*, or some remote places, for they that know her, will never trust her. For my part, my Saviours words make me cautious, *If the Blind lead the Blind, both shall fall into the Ditch.* If I had no other Arguments of your Churches Fallibility and Apostacy, this one point were a sufficient evidence of them both. But what have you more to say?

Pop. *I will give you then a Scripture-instance; The Priest prayed in the Temple when the People waited without*, Luke 1. 21.

Prot. What is this to the purpose? I do not read, that the Priest prayed at all, but only went in to offer Incense; but if he did pray, he did it alone; not with and before the People, as your Prayers are; you might as well plead thus, Those Priests said nothing at all, and therefore your Priests need only make a dumb shew, and may save their *Latin* (as well as the *English*) which

which may be good Counſel for many of them that have ſo little to ſpare.

But ſeriouſly, can you, or any rational man think theſe Reaſons of ſufficient weight to oppoſe againſt that great Scripture-rule of Edification, and the expreſs words and plain Arguments of St. *Paul*? God deliver me from ſuch a beſotting Religion.

Beſides what I have ſaid, I ſhall leave this with you at parting, That you do not only oppoſe Scripture, but alſo that Ancient Church which you pretend to Reverence, and to follow her ſteps; and your Practice is contrary to the Church in all Ancient times.

The *Prayers* of the *Jews* in publick, were always made in the *Hebrew* Tongue, and in that Tongue God gave them thoſe Forms of Prayer and Bleſſing which were then uſed, *Numb.* 6 10.

God gave the gift of Languages to that end, that the Apoſtles might eſtabliſh the Worſhip of God in every Nation in their own Language; And I am told, that *Origen* reports this to be the Practice of the Church in his time (as well as his own Judgment), *That every one did pray to God in his own Dialect*; *Greeks in Greek, and Latines in Latin*, &c.*. Beſides, I am told that your own Authors, *Lyra*, *Aquinas* and *Harding*,

---

* Ὁι λοιπυὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν οὐδὲ τοῖς ἐν ταῖς θείαις γράφαις κειμένοις ανόμασι —— χρῶνται ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν Ελληνὲς Ἑλληνικοῖς, οἱ δ' Ρωμαῖοι Ρωμαϊκοῖς, καὶ ὅτως ἕκαστος κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διάλεκτον εὐχοται τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ὁ πάσης διαλέκτου κύριος τῶν ἀπὸ πάσες διαλέκτου εὐχομενων ἀκούει. Orig. *contra* Celſum, *lib.* 8.

and

and others confeſs, this was the Practice of the ancient Church, and that one of your own Councils, that of *Lateran*, in the year 1215 did make this Order, that *Whereas in many places there were mixed People of divers Languages and Cuſtoms, the Biſhops ſhould take care to provide fit Men, that ſhould perform Divine Service amongſt them, according to the difference of Rites and Languages* ||. Moreover, that your great Cardinal *Cajetan* confeſſeth, *that Prayers ought to be in a known Tongue* *. Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *I cannot deny it. Their Books are extant.*

Prot. Then by this, I ſee, how far your Church is not only from Infallibility, but from common honeſty, that dare pretend they hold nothing but what hath been by conſtant Tradition conveyed to them from the Apoſtles times until this day. And by this I ſhall judg of all your other brags of Antiquity in your Doctrine. So I ſee you are obſtinate and incorrigible, and therefore I ſhall trouble my ſelf no further to talk with you.

|| *Quoniam in pleriſque partibus intra eandem civitatem & diœceſin permixti ſunt populi diverſarum linguarum, habentes ſub una fide varios ritui & mores, diſtricte præcipimus ut Pontifices hujuſmodi civitatum providеant viros idoneos qui ſecundum diverſitatem rituum & linguarum divina officia illis celebrent*, c. 9.

* *Ex hac Pauli Doctrina habetur quod melius ad Ædificationem Eccleſiæ eſt orationes publicas quæ audiente populo dicuntur, dici lingua communi clericis & populo, quam dici Latine.* Cajet. *in* 1 Cor. 14.

FINIS.